The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training Foreign Affairs Oral History Project

MICHAEL G. ANDERSON

Interviewed by: Charles Stuart Kennedy

Initial interview date: April 22, 2005

Q: Let's start at the beginning. When and where were you born?

ANDERSON: I was born in Berwyn, Illinois in 1943, December 14.

Q: You say Berwyn. For a minute I thought I was hearing an Illinois pronunciation of Berlin. You were born, what year was it?

ANDERSON: 1943.

Q: Can you tell me a bit about the Anderson side of the family.

ANDERSON: The Anderson side. Well, they are all buried in Draper Cemetery in Jackson County, Michigan. Rives Junction it's really called and the oldest grave there is from my ancestor, I guess my great, great, great grandfather who came from Northern Ireland. His name was Robert Anderson. He immigrated to the United States in the early 1800's and homesteaded in Jackson County in about 1830 and his descendants down to my father were born and lived in Jackson County on the farm until my father left the farm. The farm was sold in 1921. So the Andersons then moved into Jackson and eventually ended up in Chicago.

Q: What about your father. I take it your grandfather was the farmer.

ANDERSON: Yes. My grandfather was a farmer.

Q: What about an account of your father's background. Did he go to college?

ANDERSON: No, he didn't. He was a farm boy born in 1909 on the farm and in 1921, I guess it would be in the depression or the downturn after the First World War, the farm was sold because they weren't making any money and the money was then used to buy a restaurant and rooming house, maybe not immediately, but they moved into Jackson where they by the end of the 1920s they became the owners of this establishment, which was located in the factory district of the city and catered to men who were working there. My father went to school in Jackson. I know he never graduated from high school. I'm not even sure if he attended high school very long. I think about the age of sixteen he went to work.

Q: What was he doing?

ANDERSON: As it turns out he was recruited by his brother-in-law, his older sister's husband, to work as a photo engraver in a photo engraving shop that this man operated or worked in. I think he may have been the owner in Jackson and was a guy named Albert Rump. He came originally from Germany. The Germans were famous for their graphic arts. So my father got this job as an apprentice in the photo engraving shop in Jackson and he learned the trade.

Q: And did he continue in that?

ANDERSON: He did, until 1961 when he lost his job at the age 52 and never really had a steady job after that because of the automation of the photo engraving business.

Q: How about on your mother's side. Where did they come from?

ANDERSON: My mother's family emigrated, probably from Germany, in the 1700s, 1730s. Her maiden name was Grove. Mother's father's name was Harper Grove and my great grandfather was named Martin Luther Grove. It is really not too clear where they came from in Germany but they lived around Lancaster, Pennsylvania. My mother's mother was of German descent too. Her maiden name was originally Hambright, an Anglicized version of Hambrecht. Her ancestors came from the Rhineland area of Germany in the 1730s, I would guess. So we have quite a bit of genealogical information about that side of the family.

Q: Did they become known as the Pennsylvania Dutch?

ANDERSON: Yes, they were what was known as "Pennsylvania Dutch".

Q: Where did your mother grow up?

ANDERSON: My grandfather, that is her father, was a civil engineer. I think he was kind of self trained or obtained his engineering degree from a correspondence school. He never went to a regular university but he worked for a large civil engineering firm which did construction all over the eastern United States and so she was born in the town of Boonton, New Jersey which is outside of New York. At an early age they moved to Chicago or Whiting, Indiana or someplace like that and he was involved in the construction of steel mills. When she met my father in 1928 or so, her father was supervising the construction of the Jackson State Penitentiary in Jackson, Michigan. She moved around a lot.

Q: How about her education?

ANDERSON: She completed high school but that was all. She tried going to college, to Wayne State University, but actually the family didn't seem to be able to support her. She is one of eight children and the only girl.She had seven brothers. I'm afraid girls at that time were not expected to go to college and if she wanted to do it she had to do it on her own and she didn't have the money.

Q: What was home life like? Do you have brothers and sisters?

ANDERSON: I have six brothers, but no sisters.

Q: So I take it, at least from your mother's side, boys ran in the family.

ANDERSON: That's right. I think she had six or seven brothers, I can't remember. There were eight in the family so I guess she had seven brothers.

Q: Where did you rank brother wise?

ANDERSON: I am the penultimate. I have one younger brother who is about 5 years younger than I am and five older.

Q: Did you grow up in Berwyn?

ANDERSON: No. About the age of five, in 1948 we moved to Wheaton, Illinois. It was about 25 miles west of Chicago.

Q: Is that more or less where you went to school?

ANDERSON: Yes. I went through high school there and actually my mother remained there until 1998 when she died and I lived there off and on until I was almost 30 because I was going to graduate school and I didn't have an income.

Q: What was Wheaton like?

ANDERSON: In the 1950s when I was growing up it was probably, you know, one of the finest childhood homes of any place in the country. I used to deliver papers there.

Q: What was family life like? All these brothers and all this; I imagine it was sort of a busy household.

ANDERSON: Yes. All of my brothers are still living. The oldest will be 76 this year and he was out of the house by the time I was conscious of things. I'm 61 so he's 15 years older than I am. But the older ones were fascinating for me when I was growing up. They were romantic figures.

Q: Did you kind of have family gatherings at dinnertime and talk about events?

ANDERSON: Yeah.Well my father actually worked at the Chicago Daily News as a photo engraver for a long time and he was a frustrated man I'll have to say. He should have gone on to college and done other things with his life. He could have been a perfectly good lawyer I think. He had a very good mind. He was interesting, my mother was very, very engaged and the other parts of the family were always mentally aware. So, every so often we would have an intellectual discussion or talk about current events.

Q: I was wondering whether the world intruded much on you there or not; the paper, the news, that sort of thing.

ANDERSON: My Dad brought the paper home every day and we read the newspaper quite religiously. Coming home he always had the Daily News tucked under his arm and I read it voraciously and on Saturday we got the Triple Streak, I read that. I never read the New York Times. I never knew it existed. I didn't read the Washington Post or anything. Actually in those days the Daily News was probably the equivalent of the Washington Post today. It was a fine newspaper.

Q: Did you say where the family was, your mother and father politically?

ANDERSON: My father and mother were both liberals I would say. My father during his early years in Chicago in the Depression years attended maybe an occasional Communist party meeting or some other leftist organization. He didn't get involved in that. He was a strong union man, although I don't think the union really did much for him, especially after he lost his job in 1961. My father had a drinking problem I'll have to say and his main sort of retreat was the neighborhood tavern so that's how he did it. My mother was too busy raising kids to get too politically involved. I became aware of my mother's politics, most of them the same as my father's really, when the Viet Nam War came along and there was a danger that I would go off to the war or my younger brother would be drafted. She became very, very anti-war and of course we had no use for Richard Nixon. I always considered him a fraud and a liar. No, we were liberal Democrats I would say as much as anything else.

Q: What about school? Were you much of a reader or was sports, I mean what kind of things engaged you?

ANDERSON: Oh yeah, I was a reader. I was under the influence, I had an uncle who just died earlier this year who was a sort of quasi intellectual and so we had books around the house. He would give us intellectual quizzes of one sort or another and so we did things like that. On Sunday they would come over. He was a bachelor till quite late in life. He used to come over with my grandmother for Sunday dinner and we would sit around and discuss Hegel and Socrates and so on. Then I started to read and we had Modern Library books. My older brother, Dick, was a big fan of intellectual things and so we had a lot of books around the house.

Q: I take it you went to the Wheaton public schools?

ANDERSON: Yes, kindergarten through 12th grade I went to Wheaton schools.

Q: Elementary school, what sort of things, did you find some things that sparked your interest particularly?

ANDERSON: Geography. I was always interested in anything that had to do with maps or history including biographical studies of all sorts.

Q: At the age when you started to read, any books you particularly remember?

ANDERSON: Well, we had a book series that was around the house, called the Landmark books and they had stories of Thomas Edison and one about building the transcontinental railroad, one about the Lewis & Clark expedition and I read those things as did other members of the family until the pages fell out. I always loved those things.

Q: It's a great way to absorb history.

ANDERSON: There are still a lot of good books like that. I mean people make money on it.

Q: You went to high school from when to when about?

ANDERSON: Well, l957 to 1961.

Q: Did the civil rights, the desegregation of schools; I realize you were in Illinois and it was probably a white suburb pretty much but did that impact with the family or anything?

ANDERSON: Well, you know it had an impact but I didn't realize it until afterwards and what the impact was is that when they closed the schools down in Little Rock there was a guy who came up from there. He must have had relatives in the Wheaton area and there was another guy who came up from Tennessee. I won't mention their names but they were a real painful influence in the school because they were, I would say southern rough necks, red necks maybe and in fact they became quite prominent leaders in our class when I was a junior in high school. In fact, one of them ended up getting expelled. Afterwards I realized that those people would not have been there if it hadn't been for the fact that the Civil Rights movement was either closing schools or integrating schools and people sent their, if they had a way of doing so, which I thought was quite unusual, sent their sons or daughters up north or maybe they themselves moved up north. Our school was obviously integrated. We had black and not Hispanic, but really a black population at Wheaton that went back probably to the Civil War.

Q: Were you in sports or plays or anything?

ANDERSON: I did some extra-curricular things like the Key Club, the Kiwanis Youth Organization. I don't know exactly how I got involved in that. Otherwise, sports, my freshman year I was a wrestler because my older brother was a wrestler and so I started wrestling. I was not very good at it but I managed to get through the whole year, but I didn't pursue it after that. No, I was never much of a sports person. I was always kind of a skinny, scrawny kid.

Q: What about, in high school, did you get involved with history courses or things of this nature more?

ANDERSON: History, yes I was always interested in history. I took every course and that was when I first really heard about the Foreign Service. I remember from Miss Heusted who was my history teacher when I was in I guess my senior year, but I must have known about this earlier because I applied to the Georgetown University School of Foreign Service and was actually accepted. I never went there. I remember taking a course in something called comparative literature, or background reading it was called. I was fascinated. I read a lot of fiction too.

Q: How about the outer world. How much did that intrude either in current events or things you were interested in. You were there during the Kennedy period. For a lot of young people that really engaged them. Did that engage you?

ANDERSON: Well, the thing is we were a liberal Democratic family in a sea of conservative Republicans.DuPage County was the most Republican county I guess in the whole country. They hadn't voted Democratic since the Civil War. I mean it was sort of abolitionist. This was not red neck Republican as you see it today. This was a kind of New England type Republicanism. So when it came time for the Kennedy-Nixon race my family was very much on the side of Kennedy and at the school I remember we had debates and most of the students you know were pro Nixon. Of course they were under their parent's influence I guess, just as I was and that I remember was a political kind of contest and then of course when he won why that was fantastic.

Q: How about religion? I mean I'm talking first about the family religion. Where did your family fall in that?

ANDERSON: I was confirmed in the Methodist Church at about the age of thirteen I guess. That was my mother's influence. My father never went to church. He had no use for religion and that seems to have gone back a long ways in his family. Actually on my mothers side there was not really much in the way of religious observance.

Q: There wasn't any sort of influence in the home. I mean the Pennsylvania Dutch families were Mennonites. That sort of thing didn't affect you?

ANDERSON: No, not that I could detect.

Q: Where did Catholics fit into this community?

ANDERSON: We had some Catholics. There was St. Michael's Church and School which went up to eighth grade. We heard about Catholics but we didn't really know much as kids about them because there were no Catholics in our immediate vicinity that I could remember. If somebody was a Catholic you knew it because they were identified as such and then the kids from the Catholic school transferred to the public because there was no Catholic high school at that time. So when they first turned up and you met them as you were a freshman in high school it was definitely a different culture. There were a lot of ethnics and I would say Irish more than anything else. Then we discovered these were really fun kids. Some of them were pretty rough I'll have to say that. They were a lot less inhibited than the kind of kids that I grew up with.

Q: In high school you said you had a newspaper route. Did you do various things?

ANDERSON: Well in coming from a large family we weren't terribly rich. We all had to work and I pedalled the Daily Journal which was the daily newspaper in Wheaton and it doesn't exist any more but it was an afternoon paper and that had been in the family since my brother Gene started it. It was route 27. Every afternoon I had to deliver papers. I only did that through my eighth grade year. When I got into high school, no, I didn't do any newspapers.

Q: Did you have any other, say summer jobs?

ANDERSON: I sometimes worked at the local golf course as a caddy and I worked as a bus boy in a country club restaurant during high school. That was about it.

Q: How well do you think you were exposed to foreign affairs by the time you got to high school? We're talking about a lot of stuff that was happening. The Cold War was going full speed. Did that penetrate to Wheaton?

ANDERSON: Yeah, I think so. I mean we had a TV set I suppose from about 1956 or so on so that of course was a source of information that everybody had access to. Like I say, I read the Daily News quite religiously and it had a very fine foreign service. They would cover foreign news very completely and so I think I was as well informed as any high school kid about foreign affairs.

Q: Well, then you graduated in 1961and you said you looked at Georgetown but where did you go to college?

ANDERSON: I ended up going to the University of Illinois but not right away. I went and worked for a year. My father lost his job in April of 1961 so this had a really drastic effect on family finances because my mother didn't work there was no other source of income. He was on unemployment for a while and so on but I worked for a year at an insurance company in downtown Chicago. It was sort of a family tradition of going to work at the insurance companies because my older brothers had done something similar. In the fall of 1962 I started at the University of Illinois in Champaign. It was a lot easier to get into in those days.

Q: You were there from 1962 to 1966 is that the year?

ANDERSON: Yes.

Q: When you got there in 1962 what was the campus like, your impression?

ANDERSON: It was very big; very overwhelming. In fact I almost flunked out my first semester. As I recall I had about a 1.8 on a 5 point scale so it wasn't even a D average and I had to get it up to, I don't know what the cut off point was, at least 2 or 2.5 or something. So I got all A's and B's the second semester. It came together. I actually started out in City Planning. This was my first choice, the School of City Planning. It was a nutty thing after applying for the Foreign Service and I really loved to look at plans for redevelopment; the whole idea of rebuilding the central cities and so on. So I spent three weeks in that program. I told them I can't do the math, I can't do the landscape architecture, the engineering so basically I dropped out and I couldn't get in anywhere else at that point so I ended up going to the Business School. No, I take that back, I stayed in the School of Fine Arts where city planning was located and transferred to the Business School in the second semester. You couldn't transfer into the Liberal Arts School with such a poor grade point average, but the Business School in those days you could get in with anything. It was where all the dummies went. So I did, the second semester go to the Business School. I took all Liberal Arts courses however. I got A's in history and A's in economics and all that.

Q: So you continued in the history field then?

ANDERSON: Eventually I majored in history starting in my junior year. You didn't have to declare it until then. Now I didn't stay at Illinois because I refused to go to the ROTC (Reserve Officer's Training Corps). I was like a conscientious objector and it was mandatory that you take ROTC.

Q: Your mother's influence would you say?

ANDERSON: No, I can't really say that it was anybody's influence. I was just that kind of, you know I didn't like to march, I didn't like to wear a uniform, I didn't like to polish my shoes. I was just that kind of a kid. I was rebellious in that respect anyhow. My brother who was at the campus too, was associated with people in the SDS (Students for a Democratic Society) and we were radicals so of course the idea of going and marching around in an Army uniform just was an abomination.

Q: Did you let your hair grow long?

ANDERSON: No, I don't think this was yet the long hair era, you know. It was a little bit later. I never really got it too long. We were more 1930s labour organizing radicals. We used to sing union songs and stuff like that.

Q: But you had to be in the ROTC.

ANDERSON: I did. The odd thing was that you had to be in it if you were at the campus in Champaign, but if you transferred to the campus in Chicago, which at that time was on Navy Pier, they didn't have any space for people to march around or they just figured city kids don't go in for this much so they didn't have a mandatory requirement. So I transferred up, I lived at home, so the year 1963-1964 I went to Navy Pier.

Q: Now this is a pier?

ANDERSON: It still is. It's now a big amusement thing but at that time it started out as a place to unload ships, in fact they were still unloading ships when I was going to school there. All the warehouses and storages areas they had converted into classrooms. It was a great school.

Q: How did you find life there? Was it a different world; the difference between being in Champaign and going to Chicago at the university.

ANDERSON: I mean there was no after hour's life. I was commuting from Wheaton so I don't really consider it to have been a very formative experience. I did my classes. I had to get off a train, get on a bus and do the same thing going backwards. What I remember in November of 1963, was Kennedy's assassination when I was at Navy Pier. But as far as the Navy Pier itself I remember the courses. I did economics, I did microbiology. I go an A in microbiology. I loved the city. I love Chicago so that was great. They say you can't go home again. I've gone back to Chicago many times but it doesn't have the same glamour for me anymore, but boy when I was a kid growing up, the Loop, the smells, sounds and sights of Chicago...

Q: How about during the summers, did you have jobs or anything?

ANDERSON: Yes, I used to get jobs sort of working for the Town of Wheaton. I worked two summers at the streets and sanitation department. They had an old tractor with a mower on the back and I would take that out and cut weeds in vacant lots. There were still a lot of vacant lots in Wheaton. If the owner of the lot didn't cut the weeds before they got to a certain height then the city did it and billed him for it. They couldn't grow over a certain height.

Q: Well, then you graduated in 1966?

ANDERSON: Yes, and then I went back to the University of Illinois because Navy Pier was just two years. So my junior year I was back at Champaign and by then they had either done away with the ROTC requirement or since I was a junior I didn't have to do it, I don't know. I skipped around that thing. I went back and I graduated cum laude in August of 1966. I had to pick up another couple of courses in the summer.

Q: At that time did you have any feel for what you wanted to do?

ANDERSON: No. It was 1966, you know the big, big cloud then was the Viet Nam War. I knew if I didn't stay in school and get my student deferment that I was off to Viet Nam and since I had no intention of going to Viet Nam if I could possibly avoid it, I said well, I guess that means I'm going to graduate school. So I applied to the University of Chicago, the only place I applied. My uncle had gone there and gotten a PhD (Doctorate degree) in Paleontology actually, long years ago. I don't know if I had ever really seen the campus before I applied. That was the way things were done in those days I guess. So lo and behold, since I had very good grades those last two years, they took me. They didn't give me any money. I had to come up with some loans and stuff but it was a lot cheaper. I think I paid $3,000 a year for tuition.

Q: Were you at the university from when to when?

ANDERSON: I started in the fall of 1966 and I went that first year, 1966-1967 full time and I got an MA (Master's degree) at the end of that. Then I was out of money and I didn't want to borrow any more so I got a job teaching as a full time basis substitute in an inner city school as we called them. Starting 1967 to 1968 and then 1968 to 1969 and I took one course in the late afternoon at the University of Chicago while doing that; I was working toward my PhD and then while I was actually teaching I did get drafted and I went to the draft board and told them where I was teaching and this was in 1968 right after the riots following Martin Luther King's assassination and the west side of Chicago had gone up in smoke. They said "You're down there? That's more dangerous than being in Viet Nam". Well, it really wasn't you know, but the impression of people out in Wheaton was that, "Jesus, you're down there? That's like being on the front line". We had to huddle in the basement of the school when they were rampaging down the street but that was just one incident. It was a great experience actually. I don't think a great experience, but it was any eye opening experience teaching there. I got my PhD in December 1972.

Q: Before we talk about that, you say you were teaching in the inner city. What was your impression of your students?

ANDERSON: Well, these were largely black and Hispanic, almost exclusively black and Hispanic kids.The school was called the Spry Upper Grade Center and it was located in the shadow of the Cook County Jail at about 33rd and California, someplace like that on the west side, Douglas Park area. My impression of the kids, well, they were unfortunate I would say to be living in that kind of situation. The black kids all lived north of the Burlington tracks. It was segregated even then. South of the tracks was the Hispanic area and there were some whites. So our school was located in the non-black neighbourhood although I would say 70-80% of the students were black. They were kids who probably didn't have any possibility of studying at home. A lot of them arrived at school looking like they had been wearing the same clothes for a week. They weren't able to speak proper English, any of them, I know that. Everything was be's this, be's that. They never conjugated their verbs. I was just a substitute. I had one class of English that I taught and then the rest of time I would fill in for teachers who didn't show up that day. That's why they called it full-time basis because I went to the school every day and I had a different schedule every day. The assistant principal would just write it out in pencil and say here are the classes you're covering today. So it was pretty rough.

Q: You feel almost that the situation was hopeless? How did you feel about the students coming to this building?

ANDERSON: In my case, I thought I was not having any effect or impact on them. I had the feeling they didn't feel any hopelessness. I think I concluded, I can never make these kids like me. There ino way that they are going to speak English the way I do, that they are going to think the way I do and I think that is what every teacher hopes to be able to achieve, to have that kind of influence on the students. I thought they were impervious. They had no use for me at all. In fact the kids were not bad kids and they were not mean kids. For instance, since they thought since they didn't really see many white faces once they left school, they thought I looked like Jerry Lewis. Which I guess I probably did. They knew Jerry Lewis because they had seen the Nutty Professor. They really thought that was great and they used to call me Jerry Lewis. I thought, I had a great idea, I'll send a letter to the Jerry Lewis fan club or whatever it is in Hollywood and tell them my kids think I look like Jerry Lewis, maybe I didn't say that but they loved Jerry Lewis and gee, can you send me some pictures. They arrived in the mail, a big thick thing. I must have had a hundred of them. Photographs of Jerry Lewis, signed with his name on it and a letter saying, da, da, da, because Jerry Lewis is really, genuinely concerned and interested in kids, no doubt about it. Has always been. So I said, "If you're good I'll give you a Jerry Lewis picture." Lord, that set off like a near riot. Everybody wanted one of those pictures. I said, "I'll tell you what I'll do. We'll go out in the playground at recess, or something like that and we'll make a line and I'll just pass them out". Of course it was a mob scene. I mean that's the kind of silliness that I got involved in there. But still in all, that was how they reacted to me.

Q: Did that basically keep you away from the draft?

ANDERSON: Yes. At that point I was almost 26 and in fact when the draft did come, when I got my notice and I went to the draft board to appeal I was probably six months short of my 26th birthday or something like that. So that probably had a lot to do with why they decided not to draft me. I really didn't belong in the army. I was going to be a problem. No questions about it. I didn't support the war obviously. I was totally against it.

Q: Did you find yourself sort of attitude wise, against government? Did you have this don't trust anyone over 30 although you're beginning to get close to that?

ANDERSON: No, actually like I say I was a more traditional leftist. My basis was not my youth it was my ideology that really made the difference. Of course many of the people that I admired were well over 30. In fact some of them were over 60 probably. Old radicals were probably my role models more than long hairs or weirdoes.

Q: Well let's talk about the University of Chicago graduate school. How did you find that, 1966 to 1972?

ANDERSON: I was a little bit out of my depth I would say. Most of the students that were there were better qualified than I was to be there and I'm not being modest, I'm not a mental giant. I never had been. I'm not a quick study nor do I learn quickly. So my immediate sensation was that Jesus, I'm not going to be able to hack it here. These guys are all valedictorians that are here. These were all very, very brilliant people.What am I doing here? That was kind of my first impression. Actually, I never was much of a student. I never was an outstanding doctoral student. I scraped through basically.

Q: What were you taking? What was your field?

ANDERSON: It ended up being modern Europe, 1789 to the present and I specialized in German and French history. I guess I did German, French and English really, for my orals.

Q: Your dissertation, what was that?

ANDERSON: It was on the union movement among French civil servants in the Third Republic. It was called Bureaucrats in Revolt. So I went to France for a year and did research in the National Archives and at the Bibliotheque Nationale and wrote about the movement. How it got started among school teachers and sort of anti-clerical type people and ended up being a kind of almost, you know national planning was one of their big things eventually in the 1930s. The Federation of Fonctionnaires, which was the major confederation of civil service unions was instrumental during the war and after the war in setting up the National School of Administration and other elements of the current professional French civil service. Robert LaCoste was the first head of it. He was one of the leaders of the civil service unionism during the 1930s. What I saw was that unions, and it's happening here too, have a tendency, as a country de-industrializes, to move toward the public sector and that's really where their influence becomes greatest. It certainly was in France in the 1930s. Public workers were more heavily represented in the trade union movement than any other sector.

Q: I watch the French news almost every night,We can get it here in Arlington County and it's still going on. Was there a political slant or anything at University of Chicago? At the graduate school level, sometimes it's almost a world of its own.

ANDERSON: In the history department we weren't terribly radical. No, I wouldn't think you would find too many people there burning flags or any nonsense like that. I would say in the humanities there was probably a little bit more emotionalism and leftism. Over in the business school it was very, very right wing; Milton Friedman and so on. So the University of Chicago represented a whole gamut of views. We did have, in 1970, when Nixon bombed Cambodia, or invaded Cambodia, that created a huge uproar and I remember taking part in demonstrations on the campus at that time. It wasn't too different from any of the other sort of elite schools. I think Columbia and the University of Chicago, they're almost like sister schools in a way. There is a large Jewish population in both schools, radicals, traditionals, coming out of backgrounds the way I do.

Q: Many came out of the German socialist movement.

ANDERSON: The director of my dissertation, Peter Novick, was a graduate of Columbia and his advisor there, his mentor was Fritz Stern, who is still around I think. He must be 100 years old. He was German ï¿½migrï¿½ who was one of the towering figures of the study of European history. He really wrote a lot about it.

Q: In what you were looking at, did you find a particular slant or something about looking at modern European history from the more leftist, socialist side? In the teaching, was this a natural for you?

ANDERSON: There was definitely some influence there on me, politically or ideologically I guess and that would have been to turn my sights towards what they call social history at that time. I was more interested in the impact of the market on society and one of the writers that I always was very taken with was a guy named Karl Polanyi. His book was called The Great Transformation and I think it's still used. It was written back during the Second World War. Talking about the impact of the free market when totally unregulated, what it does to society which of course we see everywhere. I think he was a Christian Socialist and came out of Hungary as so many economists seem to have come. He wasn't a professor there, but his book was used in some of the courses I took and there were some others who talked about revolutionary peasantries and used studies by Hobsbawm and others; Bill Sewell who is still teaching, Peter Sterns, who teaches, and is Provost at George Mason University was there at that time too. I don't recall that he was terribly leftist though. I kind of think that he was more to the center or to the right, but he did earlier history. He actually did history of the Industrial Revolution. I can't really put my finger on any consistent, ideological influence there.

Q: You went to France for a year.What year was that?

ANDERSON: I went there the fall of 1970 until about May of 1971. Like one academic year.

Q: Had you learned French before?

ANDERSON: I actually spent a couple of months in France in 1969 and I went at that time to the Alliance Francaise and I studied for two months. French I studied in college and in high school. You know, the standard grammar and so on. It wasn't really a good preparation for speaking French and I have a terrible accent if I ever try to speak French. But I hagood reading knowledge of the language, which is what I needed for doing research.

Q: When you were there in 1969, were you picking up any repercussions of the spring of 1968?

ANDERSON: I remember going to Nanterre which was a university campus outside of Paris, and was sort of ground zero for a lot of those events. I think the place was closed down when I went out there because I wanted to use the library.

I got involved with some people at the Masion des Etats Unis, the big dorm where I was staying at the Cite Universite, full of foreign students, not just Americans. One girl, she was a Japanese-American girl who went to Oberlin, she was quite cute and a real radical. She may have been a communist. She certainly had a lot of Red friends among the university students there. Here boyfriend was a fellow from Quebec, who seemed to be majoring in agitation. Through them I got involved in the anti-Viet Nam War activity in Paris. They had many Asian friends. Not so much Vietnamese but actually more the Laotians and the Cambodians there. All of those groups had there representatives there. Not on campus so much but in Paris. So I was brought along to various events and I can remember going with this girl, I can't remember her name anymore, and some of these other guys; it was a mixed bag. This is what you do when you are in college. You're sort of getting these various relationships lasting all of two or three weeks. I don't know how long this thing lasted. Then we went to meetings where they sang the Internationale and they had speakers and we went and we delivered a petition to the American Embassy. It was the first time I had been in an American Embassy. That was in the spring of 1971.

Q: I probably interviewed whoever you gave the petition to. Junior officers were usually delegated.

ANDERSON: You wouldn't be able to do that today, but we walked right up there. We weren't carrying any kind of banners or anything but we had this petition. I don't even know what it was about and so some second secretary or somebody from the political section came down to the front entrance. I don't even know if they actually took it but in any case he was the one deputed to meet us and then the police discovered what we were about and they came charging after us and darned if there wasn't a photographer with us from L'Humanite which was the communist newspaper; maybe still is. So we take off through whatever the park is across from the embassy then there is this green area and we went running there because we didn't want to get arrested. The photographer from the L'Humanite takes a picture of us running away with the police in pursuit and that appears in the newspaper the next day. I'm sure if State Department security had known about that when I applied two years later for my job at the State Department I would have never gotten it. For me it was a social thing although I was genuinely opposed to the war and these people that I was with, sure they were Communists, but they weren't authentic representatives of the people there, but I thought about that Cambodian guy, is he one of those skulls, you know.

Q: Also the Khmer Rouge basically came out of France didn't it?

ANDERSON: I don't know anything about the Khmer Rouge other than the fact that they killed a lot of people.

Q: I think that their philosophy came out of Paris, went through the French system.

ANDERSON: I wouldn't be surprised. Sure it had that effect on a lot of people. The guy could have been a killer afterwards.

Q: It depended. The killers ended up getting killed too you know.

ANDERSON: So, that's just one of those close encounters of the third kind that I had.

Q: How did you find doing research there?

ANDERSON: As I noted, I'm not a great scholar or anything. I enjoyed it in the sense that it was not expensive living in Paris at that time compared to what it would be today. The service was great. You go to the Biblioteque Nationale. I guess you have a card. I did have a card with my picture on it. You sit down and they bring the books to me that I ordered and it was in the old B.N., not this new thing, the monstrosity that they built. It was a beautiful old palace that they had there. It was great. Then I went over sometimes to the Archives Nationale; the same thing there, they bring the stuff. They'd bring it in boxes. These were old police reports. The police used to attend union meetings of course and then report everything just like the FBI (Federal Bureau of Investigation) does and that stuff became kind of, it's good raw material for this kind of research. Who said what. I enjoyed it. I read mainly the Tribune de Fonctionnaire. Every issue from about 1918 or whenever it started publishing until 1940.

Q:Did you see the unions begin to develop; the bureaucratic impulse to begin to be more interested in preserving the power of the people at the top? Was it a pretty idealistic group?

ANDERSON: They were more technocratic. I'd say that the idealism gave way to a belief in technocracy. They always believed in those days that they didn't need politicians. Certainly they didn't need the Party. The kind of people who would traditionally run the bureaucracy, but actually you needed people who had been trained to be public servants which is of course the philosophy which went into the ENA (National School of Administration) There were at least two major levels in the civil service movement. There were of course the radicals mainly situated in the public school teachers who were a separate federation really and the Communist had a big influence among them, as did some of the more leftist groups. Then there was a group call the Collectors of Taxation. They were tax collectors who did indirect taxes. They were your typical bureaucrats. All they could think about was their bread and butter issues. Then there was this group that was in the Finance Ministry made up of upper level, mid level career people who were interested really, more than anything, in preserving the French state. They were sort of the Bonapartists, I guess you could say. Strengthening it vis-ï¿½-vis the private sector which they saw draining away all of the best talent and everything by offering much higher salaries. State-ism in France is a long and honoured tradition going back to Louis XIV, Napoleon, and Poincare, who was the prime minister in the 1920s, was another one. He was a right winger though and he was in favour of a strong state and believed that it couldn't have a union movement which would actually destroy discipline. These guys were saying, you know the plannist and the technocrats, Robert Laurent was one and Robert LaCoste was the other, that the future lay with the professionalization of the state service and that meant paying higher salaries, better training, laws that would strengthen the state service and give it the ability to compete really with private interest because bankers and so on, you know how it is. In our system we don't seem to have quite the same tension because we could have a guy like Andrew Mellon running the Treasury at the same time that he was playing the stock market. Maybe they did to, and we can live with that but actually in the old days in France that was considered the death of the state. So that's what they were trying to do is to get these disinterested, they're almost like characters out of an Ayn Rand novel, sometimes on the right hand side; people who are operating at such a high level of idealism or professionalism that they seem to lack any kind of ideology.

Q: Did you find as you were working in this, did you see the difference between the French approach, I mean the Gallic way of breaking things down into pluses and minuses and coming up with a formula or what have you? In other words did you find sort of the French approach to things almost alien to the way you were brought up?

ANDERSON: I don't know. I don't think I really quite understood the French approach. What I noticed about France when I first got there on my first visit, was not so much the thinking, but the way it was so petite bourgeois. Everything was organized around the sort of personal convenience of the shop keepers, of the little people. They kind of ran things, at least at the micro level. I never had a sense of any conflict with, I mean the U.S. approach was always efficiency whereas in their system over there the idea was to preserve traditional power centers and it's kind of infuriating if you are a foreigner in a place like that and you go into the post office and the guy behind the counter, he's actually only going to work up until a certain time and then he's gone and the store is going to close at a certain hour and will re-open three or four hours later but it's not for your convenience. That's really what the French are all about; it is really about preserving a way of doing things; the Italians too. I spent a lot of time with the Italians in my Foreign Service career. Again, it's trying to preserve society from the market mentality, the market rationality. From the idea that money is all that counts. They're just not rational, but then of course human beings are at least 50% irrational. That's where they put their emphasis.

Q: Did you have any problem at the University between, how so much is revolved around Marxism, Communism with the students and the outlook and yet from what you knew, I don't know how much you knew about the realities of the Soviet Union?

ANDERSON: Well, I never really thought of the Soviet Union as a paragon of virtue or anything like that, no. I had no problems with it because I really must say to me communism was not what they were doing in the Soviet Union. I don't know what that was but it certainly wasn't what Marx's had in mind at all. I was looking at European communism or European leftism or radicalism. I was looking at what happens, it was a de-colonization period in the 1960s and the big movement for the third world or the new countries' independence and their struggle against oppressive colonial and capitalist powers. That's really what I was looking at. As far as the Soviet Union and all this baloney about planning and production goals and all that; I must say I never really saw this Soviet Union. I mean Stalin was so obviously a blood thirsty dictator and the guys who came after him were the buffoons you know. I can't believe anybody could seriously think that these people were the wave of the future. I never did.

Q: Well then, you got your PhD when?

ANDERSON: December 1972.

Q: So then what happened?

ANDERSON: In that same month I took the Foreign Service exam. I was looking for a job, even before I got my PhD, a teaching job but I never really found one. There was just an over abundance of PhD's of history out there and not many openings. I don't think I had a single job offer that I can recall. So I took the Foreign Service exam and I guess I passed and obviously passed the written and I guess a few months later I had the oral, I passed that and I got an invitation to join.

Q: You recall how the oral went, any of the questions?

ANDERSON: No, I really don't. I have little recollection of it. I remember going to, I think it was the U.S. Customs House in Chicago or something on the west side and sitting in there and I think it was me and a few other people who were the interviewees and then there was an all male panel of interviewers. I don't know what the questions were or what I said but some way or another I passed.

Q: You came in when?

ANDERSON: I guess I was sworn in around November 1, 1973. Pretty fast action. I think they were trying to get a lot of people in right then.

Q: What was your A100, your basic officer course like?The composition of it.

ANDERSON: There were 30 people approximately I think. I think the average age was late 20's. There were two groups really. There were those right out of college in their early 20's and then there was the second group in their late 20's early 30's. I was in that second group. Out of the 30 it was almost half women I think. I can't remember how many but I can picture quite a few women. There was one black woman, an American Indian guy, Jesse Alvarez. Maybe he was Hispanic, I think he was both. For composition, there was obviously an attempt to give pretty good representation to the various groups.

Q: When you came in did you have what you wanted to do in mind within the Foreign Service?

ANDERSON: I wanted to be a political officer. I wanted to do political reporting and actually at the time I took the exam there was a political portion to the test, I think the afternoon portion of the written exam was specifically designed for political officers.

Q: Where did you want to go? Did you have any place in mind?

ANDERSON: I wanted to go to Europe. Probably France would have been my first choice.

Q: What happened?

ANDERSON: I was assigned to Rome.

Q: You were in Rome from when to when?

ANDERSON: I had to take Italian first. I got there in the summer of 1974 and I was there until the summer of 1976, late June, early July.

Q: What sort of job did you have when you went to Rome?

ANDERSON: My first year I was in the consular section. I started out in American Citizens Services so that was a real baptism by fire because I got there right in the summer tourist season and I didn't know anything about anything or what I was supposed to be doing but I had this staff of people who were, luckily I had some very good locals there who were able to handle most of the problems. They just sort of signed my name on a lot of things. It was pretty exhausting. I thought, Jesus this is not what I want to do. I was moved eventually. I think it was supposed to be a rotational thing, down to the visa section and that was no fun either. Then Russ LaMantia who was Ambassador John Volpe's staff aide, was leaving; must have been in the summer of 1975, he was due to leave so I applied for his job and lo and behold I got it. It was just luck so I ended up for my second year being the staff assistant to the ambassador.

Q: Let's talk about the consular side. What sort of problems when you came into American services were you getting?

ANDERSON: Well, mainly the sciappatori were grabbing ladies' purses. So there were just a whole lot of American tourists, women, who had their passports, money, all of their identity papers, everything gone. Their tickets you know. We had to try to reconstruct their lives. Some of them had been injured. Some had broken arms, dislocated shoulders when the bag was ripped off because they would come by on a motor scooter. There were others that were sick; came down with diseases or had heart attacks that needed to be evacuated. There were a lot of people without money and usually it came about as a result of being robbed. Of course we weren't allowed to give them any money so we had to get them into a low cost pensionin the neighbourhood, some of the local places, on the promise that when the money arrived from the U.S. they would pay. So it's constant trying to call the U.S. to find some relative or member of the family who is going to send the money and how to do that. It was just all that kind of baloney.

Q: Visas, what sort of things would happen there?

ANDERSON: As I recall, I guess Italians needed visas, I can't remember. Visas for the Italians were generally pretty routine. Except of course for those who were or had been Communist Party members. They required waivers, and this was a time-consuming process. But we had a lot of Nigerians; we had a lot of Africans in general who would come in there to try to get visas. 99.9% of them were non bona fide so they were not given a visa. They would enter Italy on the pretence of being students and would end up at the University for Foreigners in Perugia which was teaching them Italian. They supposedly were studying Italian so they would come from Nigeria to Perugia to study Italian supposedly and then since that was in our consular district they would come down to Rome to apply for a visa to go to the U.S. and of course I remember them. They were really quite odoriferous. I mean, good Lord, that part of it sticks with me and also their stories were just totally bogus. Then sometimes they did try to bribe you or other things like that. I remember they used to come and sit in my office. It was not as though they were on the other side of a glass partition or something. Now that has all been changed of course. But that was a little bit too close to the applicant and then I had a lot of sob stories from various other people who had problems. A lot of Italians or they would be brought in by some American saying this is my sister she wants to come for a visit and you know darn well that the idea is that she is emigrating. She is never coming back. Not my sister but my cousin or something like that. So that's the kind of stuff I remember.

Q: Well then you were both these assistant, staff aide from 1975. Talk about John Volpe. What was your impression of him?

ANDERSON: Well, he had a Napoleon complex I think. He was small man with a big ego and kind of a rough exterior. I don't know what kind of education he had but his money was made in construction, the Volpe Construction Company. I'm not sure whether it was his creation or his father's, whichever. He was a multi-millionaire construction industry guy. As a diplomat, well, you know he was a good construction guy. He was not a diplomat. He was obsessed, I don't want to say obsessed, but he was very conscious of the fact that he was a lower class Italian as most American Italians are. They were people who came out of the bottom part of Italian society and he came back there to Italy speaking, evidently he learned a little bit of Italian at home, but it was the Abruzzese dialect and it was sort of what the sheep herders up in the mountains used. People would make fun of him when he spoke, behind his back. He was very determined to demonstrate that he was an equal to anybody there; on the Italian side. He was a very, very devout Catholic and he used to go to mass every morning. On his way from the residence to the embassy he would stop and maybe it would just be confession, I guess he couldn't do a whole mass. He would stop and talk to the priest. His focus, he should have been ambassador to the Holy See. At that time I don't think we had an embassy to the Vatican but he still had a liaison function of some sort I guess, but boy he was very much into that and so that's what I remember.

Q: Who was the DCM (Deputy Chief of Mission) at the time?

ANDERSON: Bob Beaudry.

Q: Was there an effort on the part of Beaudry or others to almost protect Volpe from himself or keep him from upsetting the Italians? I mean the Italian crowd in Rome is, I don't think would cotton very much to an American emigrant ambassador.

ANDERSON: Of course most of our ambassadors have had Italian backgrounds. I wouldn't say most of them but many of them. The second time I went to Rome we also had an Italian American ambassador. Beaudry's role, yeah I would say he was kind of there as a deflector and to try to put a little sense into the thing. There was another Italian American guy there named Tom Trimmarco and he was Volpe's right hand man. Evidently at that time - I don't know if it is still true in that kind of a big embassy - an ambassador, a political appointee, could bring along his special assistant and Tom had an office of his own with a secretary and so on. Beaudry's problem was Tom Trimmarco because in effect Tom Trimmarco was sort of a parallel show, a parallel embassy in a lot of respects. He anBeaudry had to coordinate very closely in order to keep from crossing wires. I felt sorry for Beaudry because actually he was really the odd man out in this situation.

Q: What were you doing?

ANDERSON: As a staff aide?

Q: Yes.

ANDERSON: There were two secretaries. His social secretary and then, Dotty Bonavito. Dotty was the kind of business secretary and she and I would work to make sure that his appointments went smoothly. I would meet the people coming up, bring them to the office or sometimes sit in and take notes. Usually not though because there would be a substantive officer who would come from one of the sections to do that. If he was travelling, I would go with him. Usually sit in the back of the limo with him and he had infinite needs that seem to have come up on the spur of the moment and I had to run and try to satisfy them. It was a classic kind of aide's job, that's what it was. If something went wrong I was there to give a kick to because he liked to do that. That was his temper. He would blow his top quite often. It wasn't a lot of fun.

Q: Was there a Mrs. Volpe?

ANDERSON: Yes.

Q:How was she?

ANDERSON: She was a nice Italian Mama. She was a big fat lady, stayed at home, wasn't anybody who was on the social circuit and he also had a son, Jack who lived at the Villa Taverna. Jack had some kind of personality problems. In fact he had to be escorted out of the country at some point I think as a result of trying to protect his father. He thought his father was going to be a target of a terrorist so he was carrying a gun around and he wasn't supposed to so the FBI legal attachï¿½ arranged to have him taken out of the country.

Q: About the Red Brigade, I mean were you there during the Moro kidnapping?

ANDERSON: I don't recall actually being there at that time. I think it must have taken place after I left there. What I recall is not so much terrorism but the, maybe Moro was still alive because they were trying to do this compromise between the Christian Democrats and the Communists. It was called the compromeso storico and Berlinguer, who was the head of the Italian Communist Party and Moro, who led the DC, were trying to arrange such a coalition of some sort and of course that was anathema to us. So that was really what we were up against.

Q: This was when the Italians and others were trying to present the communist party as a democratic alternative and Berlinguer was the lead man. He was communism with a pleasant face.

ANDERSON: That was the idea.

Q: Were there any particular incidents or things that you recall while you were therdealing with Volpe and in the embassy?

ANDERSON: You mean like political in nature or personality?

Q: Personality inature. I'm trying to get a little feel for what a young staff officer, special assistant has to do.

ANDERSON:Well, just one thing that seems to stick in my mind of course is that one day Dotty, she was supposed to put all of his appointments in his book; his appointment book which was on his desk. He had this vast office. One of the appointments was somebody arrived and the appointment wasn't in his appointment book or he had made some other kind of arrangements for that time and he discovered that he had an appointment and she hadn't put it in the book and of course I was supposed to double check to make sure that everything was correct and so this incident, he called us, he's berating us quite vehemently and he takes the agenda book and he bangs it down on his desk and it makes the fluorescent tube pop out of his desk lamp and fall down on the desk and smash into a million pieces. I just remember the expression on his face. He thought he was dead or something. We're all stunned of course, but that really broke it up. It didn't happen often, in fact sometimes he could be a very sweet man and we had a lot of good times together travelling around. I had another tour in Rome. It was much pleasanter the second time.

Q: I was wondering, did you get a feel for our involvement reporting the politics of Rome or something? You had these governmental changes of personnel or something like this. We seem to spend an awful lot of time getting involved in the nitty gritty of the Italian political system.

ANDERSON: We were so afraid that the communists were going to get into the government there. When I got there in 1974 it was just about two weeks before Nixon resigned and then it was Ford as president and Kissinger was a major influence. Kissinger became Secretary of State at some point in there after being National Security Advisor and then you had what amounted to the Kissinger-Ford administration and this was until 1978. It was strictly Ford really, that was a Ford period I was there. The fear was that the communists and the Christian Democrats would work out some kind of arrangement and the communists would come into the government. I know that we worked both above and below the radar to achieve a satisfactory outcome. In other words to get the Christian Democrats in a position using maybe some of the smaller political parties, the Liberals, the Republicans. The Socialists, I guess, were not ready to come into anything at that point. To try and find a governing coalition that would be stable and could sustain a democratic government without any communists in it. That really dominated that period as I recall. So our focus was really on that from a political point of view. American influence had always been, since the war, had been very, very strong in Italian politics. Italy started out like a lot like Japan and Germany as well so it had compromised sovereignty, I guess you would say. We were pretty much still running the show from behind the scenes.

Q: Did you get any feel for Volpe's effectiveness or was he sort of a figurehead?

ANDERSON: Volpe was definitely, I don't know, concerned with certain areas of the relationship. His concerns were pretty narrow I think especially when it was the Catholic hierarchy. He was focused so much on it, coming out of the Boston Catholic background, he felt that actually I suppose that Cardinal Casaroli or somebody like that was the one that you needed to talk to to make things happen. I had a feeling that was kind of where he was focusing and I don't really know that that was correct so I can't believe that he was as effective as he thought he was because I think that he was pushing the wrong button. That's kind of where I come down on that.

Q: You left there in 1976?

ANDERSON: Yes.

Q: Where did you go?

ANDERSON: Back to Washington and did two years in Israeli-Arab affairs, IAI.

Q: 1976 to 1978 you were in the Arab Israeli desk?

ANDERSON: That's right.

Q: Tell me, who was the assistant secretary for Near Eastern affairs at that time?

ANDERSON: Roy Atherton.

Q: What slice of the pie did you have on Arab Israeli affairs? Affair seems to be almost the wrong term; Arab Israeli fight or whatever.

ANDERSON: Well, actually I think it was called Israeli Arab. Israeli because we were covering both the State of Israel and the areas that were taken in the 1967 war and that would be West Bank and Gaza. My portfolio there, I was the junior officer of the group. There were probably six people on that desk including the director and deputy director and I did some programs that AID had for assistance to the Arab population in the West Bank and Gaza. We were trying to sponsor scholarships, assistance to Bethlehem University and Birzeit University. A few other things like that and so I worked a lot with AID. I worked with some people, nobody at the Israeli embassy and really nobody in the Palestinian community but this was AID. I think AID had more contacts with the Embassy. We were supposedly giving the policy directions to AID for these various programs.

Q: How would you characterize the status of Palestinian Israeli affairs at this time when you came in 1976?

ANDERSON: I don't recall that we had a terrorism problem or anything like that. The security situation from the Israeli point of view was good. I remember making a trip out there and went to Gaza, went to the West Bank and of course never had any problems with any kind of security. So that was certainly a more positive aspect of the relationship than we have today. The thing that I recall most from that two year period was that the Begin government which came to power in 1977 was the first time the Likud got power in Israel and I remember that it was quite a shock to us when that happened. It had followed on from the Rabin government, the Rabin government fell over Leah Rabin's bank account in Washington when Rabin was ambassador here. After he left there was a big expose about how she had kept an illegal bank account here with foreign currency in it for her shopping trips or whatever and his government resigned and there were elections and lo and behold the Likud with Begin at the head became the ruling party. They were the largest party and for the first time we had a government led by a man who, from many points of view, was viewed as a kind of extremist. This was our main concern. What to do about that.

Q: Did that have any impact on your type of work?

ANDERSON: I don't recall that it did, no. Other than the fact that we had a flurry of visits at that time and I was pulled away from doing that sort of administrative work on those programs to do more administrative work when Dayan came or Begin came. We had just a very lot of high level visits at that time.

Q: Did you feel that the Arab Israeli, particularly on the Israeli side, our desk was sort of trying to figure out who this guy Begin was? They knew who he was but what did this mean. Was this a matter of intense discussion?

ANDERSON: It was, yeah, you know I recall that people were shocked as I say. I know our ambassador out there, I believe it was Sam Lewis at the time, whether he was there or he went out subsequently. I believe he was already there. He was chagrined. He definitely was not happy with this at all. It was of course 1977, thCarter administration in Washington. We were somewhat looking for a peaceful kind of settlement with things and it looked like this was going to accentuate the settlements policy taking over the West Bank and so on. Eretz Israel or whatever it was called. I mean that was a concern. We did have Begin over for state visit and everybody, I remember going to Andrews Air Force Base with all of the other administration greeters. Cyrus Vance was out there to greet him when he got off the plane. So I mean we were looking to try and form a relationship with this guy and I don't think we had much in the way of contact with the Likud at a high level up to that point because we were hoping, I guess, that we wouldn't have to deal with it. But as it turned out of course, with Camp David of course following on after that meant that somehow or another the extremist people worked better than anything else.

Q: You were there until 1978 so Camp David hadn't started at that point?

ANDERSON: I'm trying to remember whether I was still on the desk when Sadat went to Israel. I can't remember the exact date. Right after that I was in the mid-level course. I was on to another assignment and I was following it on TV and so forth.

Q: Did you get a feeling because you were sort of in the Alside of what we were doing to help the Palestinian?Were people talking within the NEA about the lack of real assistance that was coming from the Arab countries? My impression is that there is a lot of using Israeli occupation as a political issue but there wasn't much attempt on the part of the Saudis or the Egyptians as something to really help the people in Gaza or Palestine to turn into them into viable countries.

ANDERSON: You're right and I don't believe there was much money flowing in. More likely it was the Palestinian population in the West Bank especially going to places like Jordan, Kuwait, elsewhere to work and then sending the money back home. There wasn't too much in the way of any assistance. I don't know whether the Israelis would have supported that but you knew there was money coming in because the level of housing construction on the West Bank was quite, to me, striking when I went through there. I just had that one trip. I was out in Israel itself, the West Bank and Gaza maybe for a week. I just recall as we drove through the West Bank that I was struck by the number of houses being built.

Q: These were Palestinian houses?

ANDERSON: Yeah, this was Palestinian housing and so I assumed that was money being earned by workers in Israel itself, that is to say Palestinians at that point were working in Israel and others were perhaps sending money back from work that they had done elsewhere in the Arab world. It looked pretty prosperous really. There was not any sense there of economic crisis by any means. Gaza on the other hand was a classic kind of post-colonial syndrome or something. Nothing had been done. What you saw there is what the British put up until 1948. You didn't get the impression that the Egyptians during their period of control had done anything. It basically looked the same as it had always been.

Q: Did you feel at all the impact of the Jewish lobby in the work you were doing or talking to other people or was this much of a factor? Jewish lobby in the United States, APAC in other words.

ANDERSON: Not too much. I mean they were looking over our shoulder because obviously AID assistance to the Palestinians was not a popular cause with the Jewish lobby. They allowed it to go forward. The government of Israel also had to consent to anything we were doing there. Birzeit University was looked upon especially as a kind of hot bed, a breeding ground of radicalism. So I don't recall having had too much direct contact with any of the lobbyist group, APAC included. I should say that I eventually met and married a girl from the Israeli Embassy so I became pretty cozy with a lot of Israelis socially afterwards but while I was on the job I don't have too much feel for that.

Q: When did you meet your wife? Was that during this period or not?

ANDERSON: Yes, right after I joined the desk. In the fall of 1976 I had contact with the embassy by phone all the time. I got to talking with the assistant economic consular there and that was Tami Goldblum and we had worked, not on the program for the West Bank at all, although she worked, the AID program was really kind of a big money transfer to the Israeli government to, still is I guess to the tune of over a billion dollars a year. It's called budget support. So their economic office in Washington was very close to AID since that was the conduit through which American aid to Israel, government aid, was being sent. We worked with some of the same people in the AID office so I got to know her in that way.

Q: What was her background? I think it's interesting you know.

ANDERSON: She was born in Israel, a Sabra. Her parents were Polish Jews who both survived the Holocaust and ended up in 1951 immigrating to Israel. Her father was an engineer, a well educated man, civil engineer and worked on the aqueducts from the Sea of Galilee into the southern part of Israel. She went to Tel Aviv University, majored in mathematics and then before she graduated, I guess she was a junior, she had an offer from a friend of hers, somebody she had met in the army, because right after high school she spent two years in the army and I believe she was in army intelligence; so one of the people she had known from the army who was back from his job in Washington at the embassy, mentioned to her at a get together that they were really looking for somebody, they needed a secretary, administrative aide and would you be interested and she said sure. You know Israelis love to travel and this was a chance to travel at government expense so she snapped it up even though she had only one more year to go before she got her degree. I think she came in about October 1974. When I met her she had been in the U.S. almost two years.

Q: Did you get married then or when?

ANDERSON: We got married in October 1977. She of course had to resign her job in the embassy.

Q: You were saying she got expeditious naturalization?

ANDERSON: Yes, we left in the summer of 1979 to go to Poland so I don't exactly remember when her naturalization was completed but sometime let's say around April 1979 she became a U.S. citizen and we had our first child at the same time. We went off to Poland then.

Q: After your two years on the Arab Israeli desk you took Polish training?

ANERSON: Yes.

Q: How did you find Polish as a language?

ANDERSON: Really kind of hard. A lot of z sounds.

Q: It looks like a little harder to get your tongue around some of those words.

ANDERSON: Yes. Difficult to pronounce and the grammar with the various case endings and so on was difficult as well. Of course half of the words did not have cognates in English so that made it kind of hard.

Q: Well then, you served in Poland from when to when?

ANDERSON: I got there in the summer of 1979 and left in summer of 1981. Two years.

Q: Where were you assigned?

ANDERSON: My first year was in the consular section and the second year junior political officer. I was the second of two; the political consular and me.

Q: 1979 when you got to Poland, what was, first the state of Poland at that time from our perspective?

ANDERSON: Well, we're here in the consular section. I didn't see too much of the political goings on except from watching it on TV and so on. In 1979 I don't recall when things started to deteriorate there. I think if was more the summer of 1980 but could have been later 1979 too. The prime minister was an old party hack. He had to resign when workers went on strike to protest meat price increases. The next to go was Edward Gierek, the party first secretary. He had been there since the uprising in 1970. Gierek had beebrought on as a reformist. He was really the head of the party and then in the economic problems of 1979 there was a big down turn. Poland of course was heavily in debt to the West. It had taken out a lot of loans, both from governments and from private banks, and was not able to make the payments. So as I recall the economic situation was pretty dire. A lot of people were standing in line for bread and things like that. I don't know if there was an uprising by the workers immediately. I'm not quite sure what the line up was at the time. In any case Gierek was forced to resign and there was a series of others. The people who were old party hacks for the most part and things just got worse and worse. It was comparable to what happened in the 1980s in the Soviet Union after Brezhnev died.

Q: Who was our ambassador when you got there?

ANDERSON: Bill Schaufele.

Q: You were in the consular section for a year. Was it a pretty busy place?

ANDERSON: Yes. A lot of applicants and not many of them bona fide you know. There were just an awful lot of tourists. People going to visit relatives who were actually planning to work in a sausage factory or cleaning offices and so on. The Polish community, probably in Washington, or I should say Chicago and New York and various places welcomed these people and gave them jobs.

Q: Did you spend a lot of time saying no?

ANDERSON: Yes, I did. This was my first real consular job. I did some consular work in Rome too but not nearly as much and I'm kind of a soft hearted guy so I probably was not the greatest consular officer. Eventually they moved me into, after about three or four months or so, maybe six months, moved me into immigrant visas and that was much more interesting. I did about six months of immigrant visas. So I got to see the family reunification angle on immigration laws.

Q: Were the Poles giving any problems or the government to immigration?

ANDERSON:I don't know. I think people had to get their documentation. They may have had to pay bribes. They may have had to work the system in order to get the papers they needed to get out of the country. I suppose if they were in any sensitive job of any sort they would have never gotten out. A lot of the people that we saw I suppose were elderly, fathers and mothers of American citizens and that sort of thing. Not too many of them were considered prime material by the regime.

Q: Did you move to the political section? It was pretty small then wasn't it?

ANDERSON: Yeah, there was just the political consular and me.

Q: Who was the political consular?

ANDERSON:Don Black. It started out as Don Black and then it seems to me John Vought came in.It was transfer season in the summer. I think Don may have actually been there just a few weeks and the ambassador also changed. We went from Bill Schaufele to Frank Meehan that summer. There were a lot of newcomers to the third floor of the embassy.

Q: What is the number two person in the political section? What did you do?

ANDERSON: By the time I got there, in fact, Bernie Opel who was my predecessor, had already started covering the developments of the strikes and so on that were breaking out in Lublin and Gdansk. I think even when I was down in the consular section I had been helping him a little bit to try and pick up whatever we could on what was going on. The summer of 1980 was a period of huge events in Poland. I think a lot of it was lost sight of back here because of our own political situation and so on. Also because of the hostage crisis that had been dominating things in Iran. I remember that vividly. Up until January of 1981 when they were finally released. You know the deterioration of the situation in Poland wasn't sudden. It had been working its way down and by the summer of 1980 we had strikes breaking out over in Lublin and then up in Gdansk especially on the Baltic. This is something that had already happened in 1970 and again in 1976. I think during the 1976 events they had formed this committee call KOR (Komitet Obrony Robotnikow) which was the committee for the defence of the workers. They were involved in some of these areas and that was the work of Jacek Kuron, Adam Michnik and those people. Others were Catholic intellectuals being called in to try to help the workers to formulate their demands. One was Tadeusz Mazowiecki who was of the Catholic party. He became Poland's first non-communist prime minister in the post-war era in 1990. Be that as it may, there was an awful lot going on and I was just sort of thrown into it. I did speak better Polish than, I don't think I spoke better Polish than Bernie, but I spoke better Polish than John Vought who came in. I think he didn't speak much Polish at all or read it. Nick Andrews who was our DCM however was a very fluent Polish speaker and reader so he was actually an integral part you might say of the reporting.

Q:How was the Polish government responding to these strikes? What were they doing?

ANDERSON: I suppose it was the combination of the carrot and the stick. They were trying to offer the workers who were on strike a concession. The whole thinstarted over a raising of the meat prices which is exactly what happened in 1970. Polish workers consumed large quantities of meat, pork I would guess and the price of that meat seems to have been a kind of a sore point and when it was raised in 1970 that set off the strikes that resulted in killing quite a few workers actually. So they didn't want a repeat of 1970. They were very, very conscious of the fact that these were workers and if they came down on them with a military reaction as they had in 1970 it would have drastic repercussions. There was in other words a real, real political price that had to be paid so they were trying to find some way to separate these workers from the radicals, the activists, the KOR people. They're harassing the KOpeople; they're arresting them, they're trying to put them and split these people off from the working sort of element without too much success. What you were finding was that people like Walesa and others are emerging now as a kind of revolutionary working class. They have a higher consciousness in a sense and they see these activists like Kuron as being people who are essential to their success and so they are protecting them, they keep them in the shipyard for instance or otherwise protect them from the authority. I think as I say, the problems started when Piotr Jaroszewicz was the prime minister up to February 1980. He was a corrupt guy. Gierek was also corrupt.

Q: When you say corrupt in the Polish sense, what do you mean?

ANDERSON: Well, they all took trips to Western Europe where they had apartments in Paris or other places. They went on shopping trips. They had luxurious hunting lodges in the southern part of Poland. BotJaroszewicz and Gierek and others. There of course had been total censorship of the press so most people weren't aware of this but of course those who were now were able to get that information out into the public media and what happened is that they started Solidarity, it wasn't quite Solidarity yet. One of the first things that happened is that censorship started to break down. Leaflets became available, flyers run off on illegal photocopy machines or Xerox or old fashioned duplicating machines. These things were then handed out and of course they started to establish places where diplomats and journalists could go and pick up information. So we began to learn an awful lot about the underside of Polish party life. Maybe our intelligence people had known this stuff all along. I don't know. But to the average Pole these revelations about the high life of the party officials contrasted with the poverty of your typical worker and the worsening situation that they had. That I would say was one of the key elements in discrediting the party for most people.

Q: Were we making much of an effort to reach out to the workers' groups and the KOR group?

ANDERSON: At the outset I think there was a certain amount of confusion as to where this was going and what we should do. There was also on our part concern that we not be viewed as sort of directing this thing which of course is what the regime wanted. That was the line immediately that this was all a CIA (Central Intelligence Agency), NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) engineered plot of some sort. So in order to kind of prevent that from having any credibility the ambassador, both Schaufele and then Meehan, most of his first year after all of this started, really didn't have any contact with the high level or any of these people. The thought was that that would be to their disadvantage and I guess they weren't really pushing for it either although there were those in Washington who thought that would be the thing to do to show our support. Because of that, low level people like myself really had more access to the Solidarity leadership at least in Warsaw, than anybody else. To me it was pretty heavy. I was kind of the main conduit of information for quite awhile.

Q: What was your impression of some of the Solidarity people? Solidarity had not yet become a full pledged organization had it while you were there?

ANDERSON: Certainly not by the beginning of say the summer. I suppose in the fall of 1980 they came down to Warsaw. I don't know if it was the fall of 1980 or spring of 1981 and they had to register. This was a big thing. Register their by-laws, their credentials with the court in Warsaw. There was to be a hearing and everything. I mean they had been around but not recognized by the government. Of course their banners were in place and they had a lot of public image and the poster and the Solidarity bannewas kind of everywhere.

Q: I can shut my eyes and see that. It looked like someone had written it with a pen.

ANDERSON: That emerged I would say in late 1980. One of the things that we did there, because we didn't want to send high level people to the front lines so to speak or have too high visibility. They sent me, together with my wife and one year old child to Gdansk as some sort of tourist. We were there at the time, it was August of 1980 right after I came to the political section to witness the strike at the Lenin Shipyard where the Solidarity people had occupied the shipyard. Lech Walesa was their leader at this point and they had sent a delegation, the party had sent a delegation lead by Jagielski. I think he was the party leader or Minister of Economics, something like that. They were negotiating inside of the shipyard in August and we went up there and we stayed at this old hotel over in Sopot. We went down to the shipyard and there was a big crowd of people out in front of the gate and there were loud speakers and there were many, many flowers and pictures of the Black Madonna, pictures of the Pope of course. All of these things were on this big, big gate. The people were hanging all over it. It was a huge throng and it was on kind of a narrow road going down to the gate. We were standing there listening, trying to find out what was going on. My wife actually speaks better Polish than I do and so she was helping me because sometimes announcements would come over the public address system and it wasn't clear what they were saying. It turns out, after being there an hour or so that nothing was really decided as to what the negotiations were and we started to leave to go back to our car when the crowd turns and starts to run and I guess we weren't the only ones so we went back to the gate and out comes Walesa to announce that an agreement had been reached on the workers' 22 demands which are kind of a mish-mash of demands all the way from freedom of speech to government supplied uniforms for health service workers. What do they call these things that nurses and doctors wear, the kind of clothing that they wear in the hospitals. The nurses were well organized and they had their demands in there too. So you had a lot of different things stuck together. It was a kind of a mish-mash. A big roar of the crowd goes up and it means that the government had caved really. Had really recognized that they had to negotiate with this group and were willing to hope for the best and they said the strike had to end but we will grant these demands. Of course after that it was, they slid quite a bit. Then of course Jaruzelski is going to come in and fight back and repress this whole thing.

Q: Had martial law been declared when you were there?

ANDERSON: No, martial law wasn't declared until after we left. That would have been in December 1981. We were gone by then.

Q: How much did the Soviet invasion in Afghanistan in December of 1979, did that have any, I mean as far as our embassy seeing things, here was what seemed to be a resurgent Soviet Union going out and taking over territories for the first time?

ANDERSON: I don't recall that it had any impact on our situation in Poland, no.

Q: How did we view the Catholic Church? The Pope had been in for about three or four years or so. So what was the role of the Catholic Church when you were there?

ANDERSON: Very prominent. Although Cardinal Wyszynski who died while I was there had been the cardinal for quite a long time, a very strong man but also had established a kind of modus vivendi with the regime. The regime had given the church permission to build new church buildings, which was one of their major demands and the Catholic community there pretty much was able to exercise its religious convictions without too much government interference. There were huge turnouts for mass every Sunday. The church was thriving to a certain extent, as a religious organization. Which of course didn't mean that it really liked communism, but let's face it the church does better when it's persecuted and when people feel persecuted. So that was one side of the thing. I think when Cardinal Glemp came to succeed Wyszynski and Glemp was not a terribly impressive figure physically or from a lot of other points of view. I'm not sure why and I'm sure the Pope had a lot to do with his appointment one would think, why they chose Glemp other than perhaps he was conservative religiously speaking and I don't think that the Polish church had too many radicals and there was never any pro-choice movement there. In any case Gleml suppose - in a way like us - saw this whole thing as possibly something that could go out of control, bring down the wrath of the Soviet Union on Poland and result in a terrific loss of life and be a set back. At the same time of course, I think the church at the lower levels, many of the priests up there in Gdansk especially were very close to these activists, to Walesa and others. So within the church you had varying levels of engagement on the side of the movement. At the very top there was diffidence you might say and at the lower level there was active involvement.

Q: What was your impression or experience with lets say the security apparatus in Poland while you were there?

ANDERSON: Well I had had a few encounters with them. One that was quite obvious was when I went to visit a guy named Zbigniew Romaszewski who was one of the KOR activists and also a human rights activist. I think he was a physicist by training. He had done a report for the Helsinki Commission. It was to be sent to Madrid where they were meeting. I think they had these Review Conferences. Whether it was annual or biannual or something human rights and other reviews for the Helsinki Accord. From 1975 they were having a meeting down there and he wanted to send this report which he had done after interviewing a lot of people who had been arrested and incarcerated without any kind of legal representation, beaten up and otherwise. All the human rights violations of Poland that he could document were in this report and the report of course was something that the police officials there and the Secret Police didn't want released; didn't want to get out of Poland. As it turned out he had already sent it through some sort ocovert means so they couldn't stop that. When I came to his apartment that afternoon I was coming to get a copy of it. That was my main purpose and also just to talk with him. He and his wife were both activists and when I knocked on the door instead oZbigniew opening the door it was a big cop. One of these security service guys, he opens the door. At that point he said, "You don't have to come in but if you do it's at your own risk. We can't stop you." I guess in a sense they could have stopped me but what they wanted to do really was to perhaps have me come ibecause that maybe would have confirmed to a certain extent that Romaszewski is sort of under the direction of the American Embassy or something like that. So it's six of one a half dozen of the other. So I went in and Zbigniew and I had a talk and they were going through everything in his apartment. There were three or four of them in there and they were going through all his books looking for any kind of incriminating evidence. Taking pictures of everything. They love to do that. Finally they said okay. We were having tea while all this was going on. They said would you sign a statement that we said that you could leave but that you chose to remain. I read the statement and signed it. I guess they didn't want it to look like I was being held against my will. After that it became clear and then I left. I don't know if the police left or I left first. Actually later on Zbigniew or his wife came by my house and dropped off a copy of the report which they couldn't give me while the police were there. Unfortunately, right after that I was struck by appendicitis and I'm not sure if this was something, whether I had been poisoned or what. In any case I was out of commission, this must have been March of 1981 then, I was out of commission for about two weeks. It was interesting because I had appendicitis, my boss John Vought had appendicitis and he had his appendectomy in Poland, it took him months to recover. I managed to get on a plane and flew to Frankfurt and I was back on the job in about ten days. They made an incision in him about that long and I had this little one. The doctor in Frankfurt actually knew where the appendix was. So in any case that was my one contact but then later on it became clear that I was being followed and photographed wherever I went. After we left they put out a program, after martial law had been declared, talking about agents and CIA agents. So they wanted everybody to think that I was a CIA agent. Before they showed this they had the seal of the CIA up there on the screen. The TV program was called Kto jest Kto? which means "Who's Who?" It was about agents codenamed X Y and Z or something like that. I don't remember whether I was X, Y or Z. They had a number of people that had been, one had been PNG'ed and another one actually was one of the people from our embassy. I think she eventually also left a little bit early. But that was after martial law was declared. I left on schedule. They never tried to kick me out. But they had me portrayed in that particular program as a CIA agent and they showed a lot of my movements, still photos for the most part. It was clear that they had been following me around.

Q: When you went down with your wife and child to Gdansk, did you have any feeling that you were being followed?

ANDERSON: No.

Q: Did you have many contacts with Poles while you were there?

ANDERSON: Well, Romaszewski and his wife. Can't think of too many others that I would say other than going to their offices and talking to them. I can't say there were too many social contacts. Interestingly, we had, in addition to myself, why there were other people, they started because of the huge increase in work for the political section, young junior officers from the consular section were brought up on a rotational basis to do a lot of work. Some of them were out hobnobbing with young Solidarity types. Some people from the USIA were also, they would sort of use a cultural angle especially with the journalists. Polish journalists tended to be, were very well informed about what was going on in the movement. We had Steve Dubrow who was information officer at that time. He would invite people over to his house and so on. I didn't do that too much in my place. I remember one get together at a Hanukah party that we did. Must have been 1980 and we had Americans and Polish guests. It was a little bit hard to conduct a normal kind of representational get-together with people like that. So I would go to their offices for the most part.

Q: I've talked to some people who served somewhat later who came away after their contacts are convinced that there were probably three or four convinced communist in Poland. Did you get any sort of talk about the communist press or the school or something almost a rolling of eyes when they would talk about the communist party and its influence?

ANDERSON: I didn't understand. I'm sorry.

Q: Well I'm just wondering you know, you've got this press that's controlled by the communist which I assume coming from Belgrade where we had this horrible party rag and they would have these principles of Marxism classes and all this sort of thing and I was just wondering if you got any feel for Poles who would talk about this and sort of shrug their shoulders and almost dismiss this as being propaganda?

ANDERSON: Well yes, I think I probably did have such contacts, such reactions but everybody recognized that those papers were pushing a particular line and there was not anything surprising about that. There was the Trybuna Ludu which was the party paper. There was another one that came out everyday, Rzeczpospolita which is still around actually. It's turned into a more respectable newspaper. But you read those to get the party line. I mean to see what they were saying and then what did happen is as the movement moved beyond a mimeograph machine and started to use the telex and I could go to the Solidarity office and they had quite a large office.Janusz Onyszkiewicz was the head of contacts with the press and the embassies in Warsaw. He spoke good English. I could go to the Solidarity office in Warsaw and pick up news dispatches that had been sent from all over Poland. There were even two competing Solidarity-affiliated news wire services. That's what really broke the back of the regime. They lost their monopoly over the news and a lot of the information was not fully accurate either. There was certainly a lot of stuff there. I used to rely heavily on that for my cables and I was pumping out a cable or two a day.

Q: What about in both your reading and your contacts, you and your colleagues at the embassy, about the feeling you were picking up towards the Soviets who obviously had a huge presence there? What were you getting about that?

ANDERSON:The Soviet military forces were concentrated in western Poland. They weren't too much in evidence around Warsaw. The thought was that if this situation deteriorated too much why you know the Soviets would come in just as they had in Czechoslovakiin 1968 or into Hungary in 1956 and they would rely not just on their own forces but East German forces too. There was not too much of a sense that the Czechs themselves, from the southern border would actually join in anything like that. Of course the East Germans were viewed as potentially anti-Polish and the Russians and the troops that were in the country were really designed mainly to protect the railway lines and so on because most of the forces obviously were in East Germany and we didn't see those forces. But shortly after, I don't know when it started, maybe the fall of 1980, spring of 1981 we had frequent emergency evacuation meetings to talk about what we would do, how we would get the embassy out of Poland in the event that a Soviet invasion took place. There was the sense that it was imminent and I guess Suslov and some of the other Soviet hard liners had been calling for a crack down and it was not clear at that point whether that was going to be, I think most of us thought it would come in the form of an invasion, as it turned out Jaruzelski was able to use his own domestic resources to do it.

Q: What about, on your wife's side, what was she getting? I would assume that she would have contact with Polish women, wives or something and what about what the Poles were saying about the treatment of the Jews? Were you picking up anything, was she picking up anything on that?

ANDERSON: Anti-Semitism was certainly evident in Poland. The history of Poland is full of it but of course there were hardly any Jews left at this point so it was hard for them to have any real expression of it. She associated mainly with ladies at the embassy, from other embassies. I can't really think of any incidence in which, or areas, in which she would have picked up information like that. I went back to Poland from 1990 to 1993 so I always try to think and make sure I'm not telling you something from the wrong era. But I believe we went down to Radom where her father had lived to see if there were any traces of the family home there and so on. We went to the cemetery where some of the Goldblums would have been buried but it turned out that the cemetery had been totally destroyed by the Nazis. In fact the grave markers had been used as paving stones and so on. The Poles had collected a lot of this stuff and put it back. They just piled it up inside there in what was the cemetery. I didn't see any signs of desecration or anything like that. It seemed to me that the Poles had kind of moved beyond that. They focused on the communists really and the communists were no longer Jews. There was a time, I think even in 1968, when the enemy was the Jews still. Some of them were within the party.

Q: What about when the Helsinki Accords which developed into a major movement and the CSCand all this? Was this much touted at this point or not?

ANDERSON: From the human rights angle, yes I think that was definitely a conduit. A way that people like Romaszewski and others in KOR had a kind of way of giving this information out to the world. We of course were doing our own human rights reports. I'm not sure whether they go back to Helsinki or they went back to the Carter administration. In any case I remember writing a human rights report and I don't know whether it was, I don't think it was the first one that had been done on Poland.

Q:Actually Carter came in and placed a lot of emphasis but I think the initial human rights reports were mandated by Congress, I think even before Carter came in.

ANDERSON: Well it might have been. As far as the Helsinki Accord's were concerned that there was a need to do that since it was basket three or whatever it was called about civil liberties and so on was part of that arrangement and the Poles were certainly taking advantage of it. The secular Poles, the Catholic establishment less so because they had pretty much their religious requirements in place so there was not too much interest on their part.

Q: Well then you left there in 1981, where did you go?

ANDERSON: I was busy doing my job, I hadn't done much in the way of politickinto get a better onward assignment so I ended up going to the Office of Population Affairs. What do they call it?

Q: Oceans, environment and something like that.

ANDERSON: It's one of the functional bureaus that I had absolutely no interest in the job. I don't know how I ended up getting into that job. I lasted about three weeks. Luckily they needed help on the Polish desk over in the European Bureau and I wanted to get out of this job so I lobbied with the EEY office (Eastern European and Yugoslav Affairs) and they got their Assistant Secretary Larry Eagleburger engaged and he got on the phone to somebody in OES and got my assignment for over there which made Ambassador Benedict who I was working for unhappy; but I guess they thought that I was, you know my language skills and so on, I was better placed in this other job. So it turned out to be a lucky break for me.

Q: So then you were on the Polish desk from 1981 to?

ANDERSON: Well it started out I was on the Polish desk I suppose the first year, from 1981 to 1982 and thethey moved me into something after things settled down a little bit, to do, well we did a refugee program for people coming out after martial law had been declared. At lot of these people of course were put into detention in Poland. A lot of Solidarity activists, people who were otherwise swept up by the martial law regime. The question was, should we set up some way to get these people out. They wouldn't let them out of detention and let them stay in Poland, but if they wanted to leave Poland the regime would give them a visa or allow them to go out of the country. So we set up a program with the INS and others to set up a processing center in southern Germany, Bavaria somewhere. A lot of these people then, I guess it was already the refugees, there was a refugee office, and they went there. I don't know how many hundreds of them came out in this program. I was pretty instrumental in setting that up. Then I moved from there into an office across the hall. I was still in EEY. It was a new one that was set up or had been there before, to do clearances for people coming over to this country on visas, for exchange visitor visas and so on. It was interesting in a way but that's what needed to be done to that's what I was doing.

Q: So you were sort of doing the clearances but it was within the desk operation more or less?

ANDERSON: Yeah, I would do that and then I would help Dale Herspring who was the desk officer for Poland.

Q: You did this until when?

ANDERSON: Well let's see, I think 1984 I moved to the Bureau for Refugee Programs.

Q: Well let's talk about, what was sort of the emergency that sprung you out of the environmental job, population affairs?

ANDERSON: The declaration of martial law in December of 1981. When I came back I don't remember if I went directly into the job in OES or whether I had some kind of training program. Certainly after I got back in December of 1981 then there was a martial law declaration and the Solidarity movement was really closed down. We reduced our diplomatic representation there. We pulled our ambassador out in protest and the relationship with Poland became very, very unfriendly with that regime there, the Jaruzelski government. Of course the Regan administration and Casper Weinberger and all of the other hardliners in our own administration were looking to ratchet up really a campaign against the Soviet Union, partly based on the repression going on in Poland. Let Poland be Poland. Dale Herspring was really a leading, he is a very excellent writer, speech writer, and he ended up doing a lot of speech writing for our own principals and also I think for the White House. This meant that he didn't have much time to handle day to day Polish desk affairs. They desperately needed somebody in there to do things like what do we do with these people who are in detention camps and they were brutal, especially in the southern part of Poland out of the public eye. They use to beat up coal miners and so on who were on strike against the martial law and a number of the coal miners were killed. These were people, the coal miners had no arms, no defences against these guys. That was really despicable. Jaruzelski himself claimed to be doing Poland a favor because if it hadn't been for this imposition of martial law why there certainly would have been a Soviet invasion which he implied would have been far worse, being an occupied country then and blah, blah, blah. I don't know if he actually explicitly said that but that was certainly what he was implying. Of course we didn't accept that reasoning and so our government's view was very much that this was a travesty, a destruction of the Polish peoples' aspirations and we of course cranked up a very, very strong anti-Jaruzelski campaign and we didn't have any ambassador there throughout the 1980s.

Q: Did you have much contact with Polish American groups at this point in your job?

ANDERSON: I don't recall anything like that. I had more contact I think with the Polish American Congress which was an old line Polish American group. They used to have delegations come to Warsaw from time to time and there would be a reception at the ambassador's residence and that sort of thing. But I don't recall that they were the sort of leading group that would fight against the regime there. Now we had some contacts, actually there was in the interim period after Solidarity got established and before martial law was declared, the American AFL-CIO and other union movements in the United States were providing assistance to Solidarity in the form of photocopying machines and other kinds of office equipment and I think they had some people come over to help them with collective bargaining ideas. A lot of it was kind of starry eyed idealism since obviously it was still a socialist economy. That was really all I could recall.

Q: When you were on the desk were you getting delegations of Polish Americans, that sort of thing?

ANDERSON: There was a lot of pressure to help various individuals in Poland who were in detention and so there was that. The pressure was really more sort of for individual cases of one sort or another. I don't recall anything that was, I think probably the Regan administration was very much in tune with the Polish American majority and with their representatives in Congress and elsewhere. Many of them would have been Democrats but there were also Republicans in the Polish American group. They were very hard line anti-communist so that worked out real well. One thing I did forget to tell you that happened that was kind of interesting. When I was on the desk there arrives in the mail from the embassy in Poland a box or package full of items that had been stolen from us. When we had been in Poland our home was broken into. We went to Prague one weekend and while we were gone our house was ransacked and a number of things were stolen but mainly the house was just turned upside down. When we came back everything was tossed all over the place. My guess is that it was a provocation by the authorities. I don't believe that it was a break in by some kids or something or burglars because not that much was taken. Although some of our valuables were taken and some leather jackets I believe, some booze and they sat around for a long time and drank beer. The beer cans were still there, my own beer. I was on the desk for a few months when this stuff arrives and it's this old LP cover and a few other really odd things that turned up supposedly just to show us that they knew who this stuff belonged to because they had taken it. Of course we knew our phone was tapped because when I was in Poland my wife used to try and call Israel because her mother was in Israel and so she liked to contact Israel and of course every phone conversation was listened to. They couldn't understand Hebrew so I'm not sure what they were getting out it. It was kind of hard to get calls through using our phone, it was not a very good hook-up of some sort. She got a phone call from the operator or from the telephone company asking would we like a better phone so that you can call Israel more easily. I guess they were bothered because, and I think it was tapped and the phone that they gave us was probably, maybe you didn't even have to listen, that it was automatically recorded or something.

Q: Also maybe it was both clearer for your wife and clearer for them too.

ANDERSON: Absolutely. I'm sure that was exactly the case. There is another indication that their security services were on the job.

Q: Did you get any feel, both while you were in Warsaw and when you were on the desk, of the abilities of the Polish Foreign Service or something, I mean the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Polish Embassy in Washington?

ANDERSON: No, I don't think we had much contact with them. The relationship was pretty frozen by that point. I can't remember too much. I can tell you from my second tour there I had constant contact with the Foreign Ministry and they were excellent people. That would from 1990 after the communists.

Q: While you were on the desk and martial law had been declared was the feeling that the threat of Soviet invasion of Poland was taken care of, that the Poles pre-empted the problem by martial law?

ANDERSON: Yes, I think probably that was the case. I think it would have been sort of redundant for the Soviets to come in at that point.

Q: Was there any thought on the Polish desk at that time that maybe we should do something to re-open relations, that being in the deep freeze really didn't advance any particular cause or was it just accepted that this was a pretty awful situation and there is no point in trying to do anything?

ANDERSON: I don't recall anything from that early part of the experience. That was 1984 when I was still on the desk, maybe after that. I think if anything, it would have been more difficult to re-open relations with Poland than it actually was to do it with the Soviets. In other words, after 1985 or so, I think I was still on the desk when Brezhnev died. It might have been perhaps 1984. Then Andropov came in, or no then came Chernenko and then Andropov and of course they all died off. The sense was that the Soviet Union is really the key to this situation and that we don't deal with Poland. I think we considered Jaruzelski to just be a stooge really for the Soviets so there was never any thought that he was the one to talk with. Eventually I think we became a little bit more appreciative of his, at least of his influence, if not of his, let's say the wisdom of his actions, but he did take on a little bit more stature certainly by the time I got there in 1990. He was looked upon as a relatively legitimate Polish nationalist. That was of course the Gorbachev era, post-communist practically by that time.

Q: What about, you say you moved over to EUR with the Polish refugee problem. What were we doing and how did this work out?

ANDERSON: We were offering people in detention that we knew an opportunity to get out of detention and get out of Poland really to come to the United States. Some of these people were people who had worked at the embassy. I remember one woman that came over was a nurse at the embassy. She was Polish and I believe her husband, I don't think there was any American kind of connection there. She may have had family in the United States but I don't believe so. She had also been involved in Solidarity and they assumed that she was some kind of a go between. I suppose between our embassy and the Solidarity movement and she and her family were in detention. I don't know if it was that harsh or anything but that was just one instance of somebody that we said that person, we will accept them for immigration to the United States as refugees if you let them go. There were others too. Less prominent, some of them lower level Solidarity types who, in a way it was an equivocal situation here because they were basically saying that there was no hope for the future by leaving and then we were saying, yes you're right, there isn't. On the other hand, in other words there is something to be said for leaving those people there because eventually they could be the underground, they could be the generation. But I think that we all recognize, and there also was a legal problem because you cannot declare somebody a refugee in their country. They have to be outside of the country. So they had to be moved from detention camps in Poland to Germany were they went into Bavaria and there we could make a finding that they were refugees and then bring them to the U.S. I don't know how many people there were altogether in this group, maybe four or five hundred something like that.

Q:You did this until 1984?

ANDERSON: Yeah, I guess so.

Q: Were you involved in anything else?

ANDERSON: I'm trying to remember. I don't recall exactly having any further involvement in sort of high level or otherwise in Polish American affairs in that period. 1984 was when I left to go Refugee Programs.

Q: So you went to Refugee Programs and you were there from when to when?

ANDERSON: 1984 to 1986.

Q: What were you doing?

ANDERSON: Well, they had set up an office called Policy and Program. There was a guy named Bruce Sasser from the OMB who had come over was running that office and I was his right hand man. The idea was to, well we were sort of the policy planning staff I guess you would say, but also I did some speech writing, we did an annual refugee program, budget submission and he was the OMB guy who had done the refugee program over at OMB so he was very much on top of the money angle of the thing. The refugee program budget was a separate budget. It wasn't part of the State Department budget at all. It was a big, big item because we helped people over in Southeast Asia or Africa but we also provided huge sums of money to UN (United Nations) organizations and others. We settled refugees in the United States. I wasn't involved in that directly. We also did, like I say, this annual request to Congress for funds. The Secretary of State had to go up and make a little presentation. I did recall writing a speech for Schultz once, maybe twice. He was the secretary at the time to go up to the Hill and present it to the Senate and I guess also to the House. I don't know how it was done. Then we did something called thWorld Refugee Report and each embassy where there was a refugee population would send in a cable with how many refugees there were in the country, where they were being re-settled and so on and so forth. We would then compile all that information and print out a pretty good sized book on the situation, The World Refugee Report, and we would submit that along with our appropriation request to Congress so that it gave an overview of the situation. It was that kind of work. I took a few trips. I went out to the Far East to visit refugee camps in Indonesia, Thailand, Hong Kong.

Q: Where were these refugees coming from?

ANDERSON: There were still boat refugees at that time coming out of Viet Nam. We had refugees coming out of Somalia and Ethiopia I believe. There were still quite a few people coming out of the Soviet Union, Soviet Jews who weren't going to Israel and that would be coming to the U.S. That was about it. I can't remember how many refugees we were taking in every year, maybe 20,000, something like that.

Q: Were you at all involved in Afghan refugees or is that a separate item?

ANDERSON: Well I suppose it would have been under our office but I don't recall, I think we were trying to resettle those refugees in temporary asylum in Pakistan and we had a refugee coordinator in Islamabad. I think they still do or at least they did up until relatively recently who was responsible for overseeing our contributions to the Refugee Assistance organizations. Of course there were maybe a million, two million Afghan refugees in Pakistan at that time.

Q: Any particular issues or problems that you recall in this regime of refugees?

ANDERSON: Well I remember, I think I had a better sense of what they mean by the cross cutting problems. The ones that aren't East-West, you know or even North-South so much, but a global issue. I suppose nothing is, I think the movement of people, refugees are economic and so many of them were economic refugees if there is such a thing. There were people migrating, economic migrants. I was looking at Europe and the World Refugee report.I was looking at people coming out of North Africa, Middle East, Eastern Europe and so on. Coming into Western Europe, larger and larger flows of people into those countries and it became clear to me that the world, at least the developed world is facing a real challenge, crisis in a sense, demographically because in effect the population growth in much of Western Europe was based on immigration of non-European people. These countries were not really prepared, I would say, psychologically or even economically to absorb this big influx and I could see that happening in 1984, 1985. I think it has become a much bigger issue in the last 20 years and I think Western Europe, I was just reading something about racism in Holland, in the Netherlands, where people were very, very tolerant of racial minorities and so on but now because of the influx of so many Arab or Muslim refugees from Indonesia I guess and elsewhere, there is a backlash. Le Pen in France years ago it was already there against the North African Muslims. In other words, I guess you could say what I saw was a policy problem or a problem of international relations that I don't think we have dealt with yet really but I think it is certainly one of the underlying big issues. I tried to highlight that in the World Refugee report to a certain extent but it didn't come across because it certainly wasn't one of our big issues at that time.

Q: What about the issue of people coming out of Central America as refugees?

ANDERSON: I did in fact get involved in thaI went on a trip once to, there was a meeting out in Denver I remember and everybody there was an advocate for the Central American refugees or asylum seekers. It was 1984, 1985, I guess the Contra thing was going on. There of course was a civil war and insurgency in El Salvador. There were people being persecuted by the regime in Guatemala so there were all sorts of people coming all the way across Mexico into Texas and the southwestern United States. We didn't recognize them as refugees. Of course the Reagan administration's view was that these were economic migrants. Who knows, I think a lot of them were. It was kind of hard to make a distinction there. I remember going to the conference and everybody there was pro-refugee, pro-Central American migrants really. Governor Lamb, I believe of Colorado, at that time was not in favor of letting them in. I was the only spokesman for the proposition that these people didn't really pass the test of being refugees. We would give them asylum until things settled down back in El Salvador or Honduras or Nicaragua or wherever they were coming from but that they should go back home and that was our position and we weren't going to provide them with refugee status because in effect they were not fleeing persecution. If we had said that they were fleeing persecution in a country in which we had good relations, in other words one of the countries down there that we were backing, Nicaragua at that time, the Contras, you could say that these were people fleeing the Contras or the Sandinistas, but in fact most of them were fleeing the Contras I think rather than the Sandinistas. In any case, there was a political reason for our saying that they weren't refugees because it would undercut our own policy to say that. How could there be refugees from a government such as the one in El Salvador that we were supporting. Everybody at that conference knew that and of course by pounding us on this question of not declaring these people refugees they were really attacking the Regan administration.

Q: You left there when?

ANDERSON: The summer of 1986.

Q: And whither?

ANDERSON: Well, I was assigned to Genoa. I wanted to get back to Italy so I took a job at the consulate in Genoa as the Political Econ Officer. I took about three weeks brush up of Italian and then I left Refugee Affairs in April. They let me out a little early so I could take some Italian. So I got my 3-3 in Italian and went off to Italy.

Q: And you were there from 1986 to?

ANDERSON: I was in Genoa just the one year and then they abolished my position there, preparatory really to closing the consulate down. In 1987 I was lucky and I got sent down to Rome for three years to work in the political section.

Q: In Genoa, the year you were there, who was the consul general?

ANDERSON: Dick Higgins.

Q: What were you looking at when you were there?

ANDERSON: Well it was kind of interesting. Right after we got there, there was a trial of the Achille Lauro hijackers. These terrorists had commandeered a cruise ship which home ported there and it actually departed from Genoa. I guess the guys who turned out to be the terrorists had boarded the ship there and it was owned by the Lauro family. I think it was named after one of the ancient Genoese sea captains or something, I don't remember. In any case the trial was taking place in Genoa. This started before I got there. The hijackers had been captured earlier. I believe what happened is that they had taken refuge in Egypt or someplace and supposedly flying to Tunisia or some other location to be, I don't know what the point of going there was, anyway the plane was forced down by our fighters at the Sigonella Air Base, an Italian air base, NATO air base I guess in Sicily creating a huge uproar in our relations with the Italian government. Bettino Craxi was the prime minister then, a Socialist. We almost got into a fire fight with the Italian forces. Then we tried to get them. I think we were planning to take them back to America and try them because they had killed an American on the ship. He was confined to a wheelchair and they just pushed him overboard. He was an American Jew. A really heinous crime. The Italians, then after negotiations said they would try them and they were going to be tried in Genoa. So they were on trial when I was up there. My first assignment after getting there was to go to the trial and to send back reports on what was going on. Not that is wasn't covered by the press.

Q: What happened?

ANDERSON: They were found guilty and sentenced to jail. Of course we would have liked to have seen them executed but, and I think maybe they are still in jail. I can't remember what happened to them after that but they were in jail for a long time.

Q: Did that trial arose much emotion?

ANDERSON: Let's face it, the loss of life was not really great in that case. It was just totally despicable what they had done because the man was confined to a wheelchair and they pushed him overboard or some other ghastly thing. The family back in the United States were justifiably horrified and outraged so there was an awful lot of publicity over that. I think they would have preferred to have seen the killers brought back to the United States and put on trial since the person killed was an American citizen. The Reagan administration was pushing for that too but, generally after the trial, it was pretty close to the end of the trial when I got there I think and there was a number of these guys, I can't remember how many of them and they were on trial in a sub basement somewhere in this courthouse. You had to pass through all sorts of security to get in there to watch the trial and they themselves were in a bullet proof cage with the speakers on one side so that nobody would kill them. I wouldn't say that there was a whole lot of resonance to the thing.

Q: What were the politics in Genoa? The Italian politics are a thing apart.

ANDERSON: Yes and Genoa is really a thing apart from Italy. It was like going into a time warp there. It's a city that sort of stopped evolving maybe 50 or 60 years ago. It was a city that had a huge transatlantic traffic back in the days of the ocean liners. It was the home port for Italian Lines, the main Italian steamship company in the old days.

Q: I used to pick up the Constitution, the Independence a couple of times in Genoa.

ANDERSON: Those were its glory days. With the discontinuation of all the transatlantic liners, of course they did have some cruise liners coming in and out of Genoa but that certainly was a terrible blow. The maritime station down on the sea front, it just became a haunted house. Then there was a hotel up the hill from it, the Miramar or one of the hotels that had been bombed in World War II, it was still a ruin. Here I arrived in 1986 and it was still a ruin. Even worse than that is the opera house. It was also bombed. We bombed it. I think we bombed the hotel too. I think there were maybe one or two bombing raids like in February 1945 and I don't know what we were aiming for but here we hit the darn Opera House and destroyed it and it was a ruin still in 1986. 40 years later. It was right in the heart of downtown Genoa. Just to give you an idea as to how this place had just really not done too well even of course the ships were running still up until 1975 or whenever they stopped transatlantic service. That gives you a little bit of an idea this was a city where the ruling class was very rich but extremely inward-looking, inbred. No civic boosters there that I could see. Everything was kind of, it was a spooky place. They had all these tunnels because the city was built on a sheer hillside, very steep and so the roads would run in tunnels into the hillside, because it would come down I guess you would say like this and then there would be an opening and then another one of these ridges that would come down. The city was built all inside of these things. If you were stuck in traffic you spent a lot of time in these dark tunnels and then when you went up to the autostrada to go either north or south along the coast again you just went from tunnel to tunnel; tunnel, viaduct, tunnel, viaduct. You were in the dark a lot there. But the city, a huge old medieval section down along the port area and still there was pretty good business. I covered some of the labor issues there. One of the problems with their port was that it was dominated by an outfit called the CULMV, which stood for compagnie unite de lavoratori merci vari. It was a stevedore's union, Communist-dominated and I think the CULMV put out a book about their history. It goes back to the medieval times and they would show how they used to haul the stuff out on their backs, load and unload the ships and so on. Of course with the advent of containerized shipping, these big container ships, they don't need as many stevedores, they use the crane operators. Genoa had this powerful union and they weren't going to give up their position and they stood around and did nothing and collected big salaries while the crane operators moved the freight. Down the coast in Livorno, which is 100 miles south they didn't have the CULMV and that was where shippers preferred to unload their freight. Anywhere in Italy was more expensive and less efficient than elsewhere in Europe. They would unload up north iRotterdam I guess and ship the stuff all the way down to Italy and it was cheaper than it would have been to bring it into Italy because of the high cost olabor in Italy and all the regulations and all the union nonsense. In other words Genoa was a kind of economic basket case. There was no opportunity there. A lot of the young people had left to go elsewhere to find work so the population was quite elderly. No reason to have a consulate there, absolutely no reason.

Q: Well then I think this is a good place to stop and we will pick this up in 1987 when you are off to Rome.

Q: May 11, 2005. You are off to Rome. You were in Rome from 1987 to when?

ANDERSON: 1990.

Q: What were you doing in Rome?

ANDERSON: I was reporting on the activities of the Christian Democratic Party which was of course the ruling party at that time.

Q: You weren't the money man?

ANDERSON: The money man? The bag man? No I think we had probably gone past that phase.

Q: I'm joking but of course 1948 that would not have been a joke.

ANDERSON: No, I think it's quite clearly documented that we in fact supported the party. Both the party itself directly and then I guess you could say democracy, we gave money to Il Giornale and a few other newspapers to get started.

Q: 1987, who was our ambassador there?

ANDERSON: That would have been Maxwell Rabb. He had been the ambassador for several years already. A Reagan political appointee. A Republican consigliere who had been around since the Eisenhower administration.

Q: DCM was ?

ANDERSON: John Holmes as I recall. I think he was DCM the whole time I was there.

Q: The head of the political section?

ANDERSON: My first year the Political Counselor was Bob Collins, then it became John Brims. Bob had spent much of his career in Italy and retired out of Rome. He is no longer living. He had been our Consul General up in Milan and then had come down to Rome and spent much of his career in Italy. .

Q: Let's talk about political reportinin Rome. What was the political situation in Italy in 1987, the parties, who did what to whom and that sort of thing?

ANDERSON: The Christian Democrats were running the country.Bettino Craxi - who had been the socialist prime minister, I think he was the first socialist prime minister in the post war period. I think he had been in office about five years - was in opposition, leading the opposition and there were a lot of corruption scandals, a lot of investigations of the Socialists and Berlusconi, who is current prime minister over there was closely associated with Craxi and the Socialists and was viewed as one of the financial backers for the Socialist party in Milan. It's interesting to see him now running things there. Some Christian Democrats were also notoriously corrupt. Having run the country for decades really they had, especially in the southern part of Italy, established a kind of political machine that was based on payoffs, graft and corruption. Every construction contract in the South included a large slab of money for the politicians so state funds were siphoned off for all kinds of corrupt activities. As I recall the party itself was quite divided. There was the Forlani group and the prime minister was De Mita for most of the time. He was the kind of a center figure I suppose although he had a more left wing past. Forlani was also considered a bit of a moderate. Giulio Andreotti came in once or twice briefly when I was there, as prime minister. I think he served as prime minister four times altogether. A number of lesser figures, the Socialist Giulio Amato who is still active in politics or some EU position was also prominent during the late 1980s when I was in Rome. I'm not sure what he does now. What you had was kind of the last gasp of the post war-regime. I started out there in 1987. Gorbachev had been in office over in the Soviet Union for two years and the handwriting was on the wall. By 1989 everything is crumbling. The wall is down in Berlin. By October of 1989 we had the terrific bloody uprising in Timisoara in Romania which the Italians were very, very focused on. The Italian- Romanian connection was quite strong. It was clear that the cold war was coming to an end. That the Soviet system was crumbling. The communists in Italy itself were running around looking for the exit or at least some future and the Christian Democrats oddly were very disoriented, by this whole thing because their whole raison d'etre had been their anti-communist credentials. That's why they had been in power all these years. Now they found themselves sort of without an enemy and there credibility was nil. All sorts of things happened.

Q: Who led the Communist Party of Italy? The name escapes me right now but the head of it this was Mr. Euro communism.

ANDERSON: Oh, Berlinguer. He was gone by this point. He's dead.

Q: There was a lot of talk in the early 1980s about a new face of communism, particularly in Italy that didn't look to the Soviet Union. It stood on its own. Would this be Euro communism? How did we see that at the time?

ANDERSON: Yes, Euro communism. That was more like my first tour there in 1976, 1978. I should say 1974 to 1976. That was when Moro and the compromesso storico was being discussed. The idea of having a Christian Democratic government with a communist support or even participation. And of course we looked upon that with utter terror. The idea of communist participation in a government in Italy was certainly not something that we were going to accept whether they called it Euro communism or Stalin communism, made no difference. We were laboring quite hard to counteract that and in fact there were incidences of paid political announcements of one sort or another and publications both in the U.S. and in Italy that were arguing that this would be a disaster if the communist were allowed to participate in the government. By 1987 when I got there it ceased really to be much of an issue. I wouldn't think the communists themselves, they were a younger crowd really, pretty impressive people intellectually, but as politicians they weren't terribly successful in gathering a big following. Let's face it, the European left in general was kind of undergoinsort of transformation or mutation I guess in a way that the younger ones, even those who had started out as a kind of hard-line or dedicated Marxist, by the mid late 1980's were having to kind of rethink it and refashion their whole ideology. Massimo D'Alema was the leader of the communists, a young fellow, I think he is still active over there in one of the successor parties. Their old working class stuff, L'Unita you know, their newspaper and their red flag marches and protest of this that and other thing. Of course the labor union movement was, all of it was undergoing a kind of terminal deterioration. You could see happening in Italy really, much the same thing that was happening over in the Soviet Union. The Italian communists were trying to escape a sinking ship you might say, but I don't think they ever made it. Obviously the party went to pieces afterwards. After 1989, 1990, 1991, I don't know when they started to splinter as did the Christian Democrats. So today Italian politics is a bunch of debris at this point.

Q: How about the Christian Democrats? How did you find it? Its membership and what we were interested in and what they were interested in about us?

ANDERSON: A very diverse membership. Its leadership, I would say, or many of the local leaders, and I had contact with a great number, were not too different from our own way of thinking. I think we found them very compatible for the most part.They were the kind of guys you would see belonging to the Rotary, the Knights of Columbus. They participated in community affairs. They were rooted in the communities; most of them, representing kind of the upper middle class point of view. Italy, like most of Europe, was divided. There was a working class and a bourgeoisie and then there was a sort of upper class I guess you would say. The Christian Democrats appealed mainly to that middle class, church going, gente perbene, as they used to say, group and most of the people who were in it were that way especially if you went to central and northern Italy. Go further south there was tinge of the Mafioso in the whole thing too.

Q: Were we concerned about or reporting, or did you see it, on the corruption within the party?

ANDERSON: There were certainly reports on that. As I recall various attempts were made to try and figure out a political system. I'm trying to remember how exactly they were try to re-jigger things that would create a more responsive political class, whether try to get away from some of the proportional representation which caused a lot of splintering because the Christian Democrats, even in their best year, never reached 50% of the electorate. I think maybe they got low 40's but by the time I was there they were more in the 30's. The communist in the 20% and then a whole slew of other people picking up the others, liberals, republicans, the MSI, proto fascists or neo-fascists groups and so on. The Lombard league. There's just all different kinds of groups coming up. Their problem was they couldn't form a coherent government because really it was just a question of getting into power. In terms of actually putting forward a program, nobody would agree to anything. They couldn't get a majority on almost anything. The big push when I was there, you got to get ready for the European Union.The Maastricht Agreement I think called for some kind of changes by January 1, 1990 if I'm not mistaken. Oh, Italy is not ready and the Christian Democrats were very pro-European Union. In fact the Socialists I think were also pro European Union. The Communists much less so of course seeing the deepening of EU involvement as something that would really dilute their influence and there were many regional and local groups in Italy that were also very anti-European. The trade unions, a lot of them also felt that there was a threat to their kind of established position there. The Christian Democrats, to their credit, were visionary in the sense as they were elsewhere in Europe, looking towards the creation of a much more unified European community so that came across.

Q: Did we have any message during this time?

ANDERSON: Well as I recall the main message - and it wasn't so much coming out of the political section maybe, as I don't know, maybe it was political but at the highest levels - was the putting in place and defending these INF, these intermediate nuclear force missiles down in Sicily. I think they put some up in northern Italy too. This was the period in the mid 1980s where the Soviets of course had put in there medium range missiles and then we had responded with our own deployments and it was very unpopular in Italy among the left groups and the peaceniks and so on declaring this makes Italy a target and these things are really destabilizing and dah, dah, dah. Of course our view being that, well what are you talking about, this is exactly what Italy and Europe needs to defend itself against Soviet blackmail. So that was the big issue and it started before I got there, but it continued and then right into that period of Gorbachev and Bush they, I think before I left that had already agreed on dismantling these missiles on the timetables. I saw that happen and certainly when I got there our big issue was to convince people and of course the Christian Democrats were on our side with this as were the Socialists. They were pro these missiles and this whole strategy of dealing with the Soviets. That dominated to a certain extent. We had to sell that, but it wasn't too hard of a sell to the Christian Democrats. Public opinion in general had to be convinced that these missiles and our strategy was a good one.

Q: What about, during this time what sort of role was the Catholic Church playing?Did it have a role?

ANDERSON: Well, it certainly did after the collapse of some of these communist regimes. You could see what was happening in eastern Europe especially with Pope John Paul II in the Vatican that Italy was focused on developments in places like Poland and then eventually as I said, Romania and then the whole cold war conclusion there in eastern Europe. So the church was focused on that seeing that I suppose as a terrific victory for not just democracy but for Catholicism too. Of course, Italians not being terribly religious, I mean the great mass of the population being pretty indifferent to the Catholic religion even though they are nominally Catholic, didn't really see the church or the triumph of the church if you will as anything to get excited about. Christian Democrats themselves of course should have been more out in front on what a great thing this was for Catholicism but they were very secular Catholics I would say.

Q: I have to say that you're right. You look at a congregation, I mean going to a mass is mostly women and the guys staying outside and smoking. It was only when they had a special high mass with all the politicians down Naples anyway, we'd all show up along with the communist delegates, we'd all show up for a mass because somebody got killed or it was a special day or something and then we'd all go our own way and the women would come back into the church.

ANDERSON: I do think this is true of European Catholicism in general and the European approach to religion. It's very different from Americans and I've seen this. American Catholics and European Catholics are two entirely different fish. The odd thing is of course is that American Catholics don't recognize that. In fact I saw that with Volpe when I was over there. Maxwell Rabb, I don't think he was Catholic.

Q: I think he is Jewish as a matter of fact.

ANDERSON: OK, fine. His successor, Secchia was Catholic and Italian American but without any real understanding or appreciation for what made Italians tick. One of the big problems of course with our foreign policy toward Italy was that we thought and maybe this is true generally, we thought they were like us. They're not. They're Italians. They have an entirely, I wouldn't say entirely, but very different approach to things. They certainly don't subscribe to our kind of ardent religious beliefs. The great majority of Italians are, outside of course a few hard core Catholics, very indifferent to Catholicism. It's not something that really drives their lives at all. Therefore they had no trouble with legalizing abortion, divorce and all these other things that are so controversial here.

Q: You were there during the fall of the Berlin Wall and the various things that came. The eastern European countries sort of shucking off the soviet yoke. How did that play in Italy, particularly with the parties, did this make much of a difference?

ANDERSON: Oh well, you can imagine the dilemma that it posed for the Communists because they didn't know whether to you know, I could use some very crude expressions, but in any case the result was that they were at a loss. No question about it. The Christian Democrats certainly welcomed this as best I could tell. The Socialists as well, all the democratic parties and they were sympathetic. Italians are wonderful people, just all heart really and they saw the poor children up in Romania who were suffering and of course this stupid dictator they had had up there, Ceausescu, had this pro-natal policy that made these women have children and then of course they were abandoned or whatever. They had whole state nurseries full of abandoned children. I can remember the pictures they would show of these nurseries full of these abandoned children. The Italians wanted to all run up there and get those children and bring them back to Italy and take care of them. The same would go for Polish people. They were suffering in some way. The Italian heart was open to these people of Eastern Europe and viewed them as victims. To me the Italians in general, there approach is to sympathize with what they see as victims. They believe that the world is made up of a few big shots and a lot of underdogs and they identify with the underdogs. This comes across in almost every respect and that of course does not play to our advantage because in effect they view us one of the oppressors. The Italian popular opinion is always going to move directly toward identifying with those people who are being trampled under foot because they themselves for generations, who knows since for how long, they have always felt trampled by their own leadership I suppose as much as anything else and by outsiders and by the world in general. So they've got that kind of a mentality.

Q: Did any of the other countries see, I think of France and Germany particularly, did they have any particular ties to any parties or influence there in Italy or is Italy sort of pretty much doing its own thing?

ANDERSON: Christian Democrats do have an international of their own there in Europe. It is a very loose knit kind of thing. So every so often, why Helmut Kohl would come down and hobnob with the Christian Democrats and they would go up and meet with him. I guess Jacques Chirac in France would have felt some ties to Italian Christian Democrats, but in general the French don't have much to do with the Italians. Mitterrand, a Socialist, was the prime minister up in France at that time so that was not really the same. Craxi would go up there and deal with him. The Communists really did not seem to have any other European counterparts. I think most of the other communist parties, the French which I suppose still existed, would be the only one and I don't recall that there was any great love lost between the groups. At ontime the Italian Communists were close to reform communists in Eastern Europe, particularly to Dubcek and the Prague Spring.

Q: The communist party in France was still a Stalinist type of party. I mean much more oriented towards the Soviet Union where the Italians were off doing their thing.

ANDERSON: Right, I think that was true.

Q: France was odd man out in some of these changes in the communist party at that time.

ANDERSON: I mean they had become much more marginalized I would say than the Italian communists who had obtained a level of legitimacy that the French communists hadn't seen since 1948 or so.

Q: As a Political Officer how did you find the social life, I'm thinking more a contact in all this. How did this work?

ANDERSON: With the Italian contacts? Well, I actually got to know one member of the Chamber of Deputies. Actually up in Genoa I got to know one there and he was always available for lunch. His family ran a silk business of some sort. Of course he was always presenting me with silk ties and I still have a few of them complete with spaghetti sauce slopped on them. He was a Christian Democrat. Down in Rome, why I got to know a guy named Bruno Ferrari, and I don't know what happened to him. Bruno and his wife were good friends of ours at that time, my wife and I. He was from the place where they make the railroad cars up there, Brescia, outside of Milan. So he was a northern Christian Democrat. He was a former school teacher. In fact one of the reasons he latched on to me is he was a teacher of EnglisI guess and wanted me to get materials for his books or something, he was still writing books and his wife was also a school teacher.They invited us up to Brescia in 1990, just before we left, so we spent a weekend with them and they showed us around. When we came back here in 1990 on home leave, before going to Poland, Bruno and his wife came. We were out in San Francisco because my home leave address was then with my brother out in San Francisco and they came to San Francisco and we showed them around there and then we went to visit my mother in Chicago and Bruno and his wife came to Chicago and we showed them around Chicago then we said goodbye to them and really haven't had any further contact with them since 1990. It was possible, in other words to do that sort of thing. From my previous tour when I was single in Italy I did have some Italian friends too. I had a very good Italian friend, used to be my girlfriend really, at the embassy in Rome. I kind of lost contact with her recently. With the male group anyhow, maybe it's not true of the female friend, but the male was, these are people who operate on the principle that I'll scratch your back, you scratch mine. This is strictly a society in which friendship is an exchange of favors and you have to recognize that and accept it. That's just part of the deal. They have you over for dinner or they do something nice for you, well you have to do the same thing for them. They are extremely good at that calculus of benefits, whatever it's called, something like that. It kind of bothers me. It bothered me at the time because in effect it's basically saying that friendship is really just that. It's not friendship but actually an exchange of favors, but that's the way they have always done it, that's the way they've always lived I suppose outside of their immediate family, and maybe their very closest friends. But if you're in that other circle of contacts it's strictly what's in it for me kind of arrangement. When there is no longer anything in it for them, why that's it. You don't hear from them anymore.

Q: How did you find Maxwell Rabb as the ambassador? Did you have much opportunity to see him in action?

ANDERSON: Well he was very old. He had been around since the Eisenhower administration.

Q: He was sort of Chief Secretary or something?

ANDERSON: In the White House, right. He was kind of a, and I had never heard of him to tell you the truth, I then afterwards went back and looked in some of my history books and sure enough there he was. He was a wealthy man, I think from California, contributor to the Reagan cause and who knows what else. He and his wife you know were. He was an amiable guy.His wife was considered to be a real hell on wheels type to the other women at the embassy and so on. I think the overlap there was maybe about a year then he left and then Secchia came. He was the longest serving American Ambassador. He wanted to stay on so that he could have this accolade that he had been there eight years or something like that; both Reagan administrations. Then when Bush came in, that's what happened why of course. Then it was time to go. I think he was pretty effective. The thing is the relationship with Italy is pretty solid. The ambassador there was obviously not playing a real crucial role I wouldn't think in terms of our relationship. There was a case of the Achille Lauro thing and the plane that was forced down at Sigonella and all that. That happened before I came, just before I came. There were still reverberations from that. I lot of hard feelings and soreness.

Q: On both sides?

ANDERSON: No, I think on the Italian side. We pretty much got what we wanted out of it even though we pointed our guns. The thing is of course, it was again that we pointed our guns at their people, the Carabinieri there at the airport in Sigonella as I recall and it's just like what happened here with these people, these poor people who were trying to get this woman journalist out of Iraq and then got shot up by our people. It's a very similar kind of thing. Here we are trying to explain what we're doing and they of course are assuming, once again the Americans are kicking us in the gut. They're good friends and that's the kind of relationship it is unfortunately.

Q: When you lived there in 1990 what happened? Where did you go?

ANDERSON: In 1990? That's when I left there.

Q: That's what I mean, when you left?

ANDERSON: Where did I go from Italy? To Warsaw.

Q: But you took Polish before?

ANDERSON: Yes, because I had already had a tour in Warsaw so my Polish goes back to 1978, 79 when I was at the Foreign Service Institute.

Q: Did you bring it up to date?

ANDERSON: Yeah, I think I maybe had two or three months of Polish refresher and got it up to 3-3.

Q: Then you were in Warsaw from 1990 to?

ANDERSON: Till 1993.

Q: Must have been a world of change sincyou had been there before or had it changed?

ANDERSON: Oh yes. There certainly was a lot of change and the change was going on as we got there. You could see it happening before your eyes. The consumer revolution had struck which is the way I see it. It had ceased to be a political issue and was more of an economic issue at this point I'd say. Although obviously the development, I think it was 1989 already, the Mazowiecki government had come in. They had some kind of communist majority, fake majority in the parliament there, Sejm, as it is called. Then that had been swept away in another election. They had set up this kind of attempt to have a controlled democracy. A controlled election there so it would guarantee that the communist would still retain hold over at least one House of Parliament. In any case, by the time I got there in the summer of 1990 the communists had been pushed now really out of power altogether, except that General Jaruzelski remained as president a while longer, until he was replaced by Lech Walesa in December 1990. Tadeusz Mazowiecki was the prime minister when I arrived there, a Catholic intellectual who had been an advisor to Solidarity during the strikes of 1980 and 81 and then I suppose had been interned at one point and then released and whatever. Bronislaw Geremek was another Catholic intellectual who eventually became foreign minister there and so on. These guys were the moderate voice of reform in a situation where the country was more interested in economic issues I would say. People saw their economic security evaporating, not that it was great to begin with but they did see that there was inflation, people didn't have enough money, a lot of jobs disappeared as a lot of these uneconomical state concerns were closed down. Unemployment was way, way up. I have no idea what the percentage was. Here they were trying to bring about a new regime or a new democratic way of life in Poland at the same time of course that the economic situation had disintegrated.

Q: Poland, I mean all these eastern European countries sort of chose different paths. As I recall Poland had chosen to sort of bite the bullet and make the change to a capitalist economy and to suffer the hard knocks.

ANDERSON: That was the theory. Jeffrey Sachs's "shock therapy" or whatever they called it. The idea being that there is no easy transition from a communist non-market to a market economy. You kind of have to do it all at once which in my opinion is baloney. I don't think there is any truth to that. You see what's going on over in China right now. In fact it just proves what Sachs was saying that in fact they've managed to, okay they're getting rid of their state sector, but their doing it gradually. What they have managed to do of course is to finance this whole old sector with the vast profits that they are making through cheap labor and exporting their goods to the west. Poland never succeeded in doing that. Of course China's ace in the hole was that it had all this cheap labor and is able to get all this foreign investment. Poland didn't attract foreign investment that way. That was the missing element obviously and it still hasn't really attracted foreign investment in anything like the amounts that they would have liked to. While I was there there was very little foreign investment.

Q: What was your job at the embassy?

ANDERSON: I was doing reporting on political developments internally. I'm trying to think. I also did a lot of running back and forth to the foreign ministry. I sort of had a mixed portfolio. I did some of the new parties. There had been a number of new parties formed, when the Sejm, the Polish parliament, was elected on a free basis and I think they had their free elections like in 1990 shortly after I got there and shortly before, I can't remember. There were maybe 20 different parties.Then the Solidarity Coalition sort of started to split up. I always thought of Solidarity as the germ cell for the future civic or free society of Poland. Of course it included everything from right wing kind of neo-liberal type thinkers all the way over to socialists, Kuron and people like that. There was no coherence to it. All it had in its coherence was they were all anti-communist. They all wanted to get rid of that. Once that regime was gone why then you saw this germ cell sort of split up into all these different organs if you will, all these different pieces. I was following the free marketers. One was the parti przyacziu piwa. The "beer lover's party" it was called. They actually elected quite a few people to parliament. They were campaigning on the idea that we need to replace vodka consumption with beer. It's a much more healthy drink. It's going to have much less toxic effect. That was partly a joke but partly it was also serious. I think there was a previous attempt to do this down in Czechoslovakia. That's kind of where they got the idea.

Q: Who was the ambassador when you were there?

ANDERSON: It was Tom Simons. He arrived in September 1990, just the same time I did so he was new. He stayed and left just about the same time I did. Our tours you might say coincided.

Q; I would think at this point you would have been hit by an awful lot of visitors from the United States, both political and advisory types and all that. This was the time that we were thinking American expertise would come in to change the world.

ANDERSON:There was like, I don't know, an AID mission there. In fact it had been established, I'm trying to think how they had that set up, but a lot of that kind of you might say consultants and advisory stuff was being handled outside the political section, certainly even sometimes outside the embassy. There was some kind of cooperative arrangement set up to fund these things. Congress had passed money for aid to European blah, blah, blah. I'm not sure and of course the European Union or whatever they called themselves at that point had similar, you know had dumped a lot of money into this. We had consultants out the wazoo, they were all over the place. In terms of government to government stuff, it was still pretty rudimentary. I think one of our big issues there as I recall was to do something about this huge foreign debt that the Poles had and I don't think it had ever really been properly dealt with. The Paris Club had postponed it you know and I don't even know if they were paying interest on it. I think it was something like 35 billion dollars. Down in the economic section I know they were working to try and put that on a more manageable basis. I think we were going to forgive a lot of it, PL480 or whatever other kind of debt that they owed on a government to government basis. A lot of it was just written off. Stuff like that. That was our aid to them.

Q: How did you find dealing with political parties? Was the process that they were learning how to be political parties or were they all over the place or what?

ANDERSON: In a new situation like that where there is no previous experience being politicians. These were all guys who had been, I don't know where a lot of them came from, out of academia, some of them maybe had been sort of trade union types, but even the trade unions were sort of, free trade unions were a new idea. They were inexperienced. There were an awful lot of personality clashes. People were trying to establish a party really of one it seemed like a lot of times. So you had many, many different rivalries going on, former Solidarity types. There was a pair of twin brothers there - the Kaczynski brothers - but in any case they were the head of the Centrum it was called. They called their party the center party which it really wasn't but it was a successor to Solidarity and Solidarity had its own. It couldn't make up its mind whether it was a trade union or a political movement or what it was. It had sort of one foot in and one foot out of the political arena identifying or endorsing various candidates. You had a lot of lawyers, people who had come out of the liberal professions, I would say mainly lawyers, but some teachers and professors who got into the thing without too clear a notion as to what their program was but sort of advancing their own particular interest. I used to cover the parliament quite a bit. Go over because we were just a few steps away from the parliament house. There were constant, seem to be, crises of government because the government could not maintain any kind of a parliamentary majority. They kept splintering. So that was an issue.There was another guy who came in there who was kind of a hardliner. I can't remember his name right now but in any case his backing was more kind of I would say anti-western in a way. Lesczek Mocuzulski was this one guy, it was called the KPN, Committee, what did they call it, not committee, in any case his party was almost proto fascist kind of group you know. We watched him. Then he was replaced by an American Pole who came over there. A guy named Tyminski. He was a complete and utter nutcase but he got a lot of votes too. They had elections there. I think he was running against Walesa for president or something. When Walesa decided to run for president that was a big issue. Whether he should do that or not because he had been kind of the hero of the resistance to the communists, but a lot of people didn't think of him as being presidential material. He wasn't distinguished enough. Well that was just a challenge to him to sort of say, well darn, I can be president and of course he did get elected president. He did a credible job I guess. What happened of course is that the movement went on sort of without him. Once you're president it was more of a figurehead position although he tried to make it more of a power spot. Things kind of went on without him and he resented that and there was just a lot of bad feeling between him and government. He was trying to run things out of the Belvedere Palace and the government of course had its own program. So you just had the sense that there was no good political structure there. No parties that were really worth the name. Of course no clear idea of a government program that was agreed upon and no constitutional coherence between the role of the president and that of the prime minister. I think the current guy there, Kwasniewski, and he's been there quite awhile and of course he is a former communist and I knew him when I was there. I think he is called president. The prime minister in other words has lost.

Q: More like the French model.

ANDERSON: That seems to be what it's evolved into. But always before the president had been, under the communists, the presidential office had always been a kind of figurehead one. I don't know whether they have done some, they must have passed some constitutional amendments that I'm not aware of. There was a period if you will of incoherence there in terms of where the power lay and how it was to be exercised and where we're going. People of course realized that and I think pretty soon they started to turn back towards the old communists or the former communists. Cimoszewicz, I think his name was, was in there for awhile as prime minister or maybe president and now Kwasniewski. I guess in a way it's kind of what Russia has done with Putin. Of course the Russians never did have a non-communist political class that ever achieved any kind of position. They never had a Catholic intellectual or anything. What you find is that building a political class is something that just doesn't happen overnight. It's like saying, "Oh well, gee we should have a whole class of entrepreneurs here that are going to start running all these businesses that the state used to run." Where are they? They don't exist. You don't just say, "Oh well, they're just going to pop up automatically." They don't. In fact you very often get thugs of one sort of another or just people who have no reason to get into those positions. Opportunists I guess you would say. Both political and economic opportunists who get a hold of power and then you have to root them out eventually because they are dragging things the wrong way.

Q: While you were there were we interested, were they interested in joining NATO?

ANDERSON: Oh yes.

Q: How was that planned?

ANDERSON: How was it planned? Well, I mean the Solidarity groups were very much in favor of it. This was to them of course the guarantee that they would not be invaded by the Russians who they still felt were a threat. I remember many times hearing from my contact Andrzej Kern who was the deputy president of the Sejm, "Oh we've got about ten years to get our house in order here because then the Russians are going to get back on their feet." He said this in 1990 or 1993 so I don't think he was really right but let's face it once they are back on their feet they're going to try and take back what they lost. They always looked at the history of the Soviet Union or Russia going back to the Tsarist times that it was not going to accept permanently its loss of status and I think our friends in the Baltic states also feel that way and Ukraine certainly feels that way. It's only a question of time until the Russians get their act together and once they do they are going to try and re-assert their control over this area and that's why they felt NATO the sooner the better. The sooner they got inside that NATO kind of defence line, why then they would feel secure.

Q: Were you saying well cool it because this isn't going to happen right away or what were we saying?

ANDERSON: I can't remember making too much of it. We had a lot of visitors. Colin Powell was out when he was head of Joint Chiefs to talk with their defence secretary or defence minister. I remember going to that meeting and Powell reassuring him that we would stand by them. They shouldn't worry. This was before they were in NATO and trying to work out some cooperative arrangements for training purposes and so on. Our own policy towards the former Soviet Union by that point, because in August of 1991 while I was in Poland, why the thing disintegrated, was obviously up in the air too. The Bush administration was shocked by what happened. Let's face it. They didn't know what to do. They were afraid. They didn't want Germany to reunify too quickly. They were afraid that we would have a very difficult time controlling a reunited Germany. In a sense you could say that Bush was sort of rooting for Gorbachev there for awhile and I think Reagan and the Europeans, the West in general. They thought Gorbachev really, oh you know don't rock the boat here Poles because you know you're going to make it even harder for Gorbachev to try and get this thing under control. Obviously by 1991, August of 1991, with the overthrow of Gorbachev and the coming of Yeltsin and all that. Then we're faced with a very different situation. It was out of control. Nobody was in control of what was happening and our policy was, as best as I could tell, basically we're running along behind what was going on.

Q: Did the Gulf War between Iraq and United States and other powers, did that hit when you were there?

ANDERSON: Yes.

Q: What was the Polish reaction to that?

ANDERSON: They were very, very supportive. The Poles had had a very close relationship with Iraq during the communist period. During the communist period they had provided a lot of military, not military, but a lot of commercial equipment to Iraq, machinery and I don't know what else. In any case they were getting oil from Iraq up until 1991. They had gotten quite a bit of oil so one of the impacts of the Iraq War was that they lost that supply of oil and then where is it going to come from and oh, we're not supposed to get it from Libya either. They were kind of at a loss and I guess we said we would help them make up their lost oil supply. So that was on one level. The other was I think Polish public opinion was pretty much on our side. I remember that the army put an armoured personnel carrier or something out in front of the embassy to provide us with security, whatever good that was going to do. I'm trying to remember. There were quite a few Iraqis in Warsaw at the time. Students and others, but I think a lot of them were anti-regime and they did march and demonstrate in favor of the war and against Saddam Hussein. Poles in general did not see this as their fight. I did have the job of going over to the Foreign Ministry, once the war was over, 1991 or so, Poland took care of our interest section. They were our representative in Baghdad and I was the go-between, between the foreign ministry and the State Department. We used to carry messages back and forth and they had their representative down in Baghdad. We'd be sending back reports to the foreign ministry and then I would go over, they couldn't give them to me I guess, maybe they could have, but they always read them to me and I'd have to take notes on these reports about what is going on in Baghdad. I'm not sure how much of that stuff was really useful. But, let's face it, we didn't know what was going on in Baghdad even a few years ago, much less in 1991 or 1992, so I'm sure it was of some use to analysts back in Washington. That was the nature of the relationship with Poland and I think up to the present day they still have troops there. Poland was very supportive and saw this as a way to gain favor with us, no doubt about it, by representing our interests there in Baghdad. Poland thought it was building up capital with the Americans. Of course the guy I use to deal with, Cristoszyk, I think eventually became the Polish Ambassador in Baghdad. He was an old Americas department guy back from the communist days and he spent a lot of time here in Washington. Interesting guy.

Q: How about the European Union or it may have been the European Community at that time, probably getting close to being the Union. Was this another attraction or was this seen as pretty far away as far as Poland getting its act together?

ANDERSON: They were talking about it but I think they recognized that there was this tremendous amount of work to be done to get ready for that. More so than for NATO which of course is going to come in and help them get their military organized. Of course economically Poland was still a bit of a basket case even by the time I left there. They're mainly interested in getting foreign investment and getting access to the European market. Of course becoming part of the European Union was looked upon as a really essential element. They wouldn't want to be excluded from it because obviously then they have this big tariff area. They saw themselves as an agricultural power as well and they wanted to provide agricultural goods to Western Europe which of course brings them into conflict with the common agricultural policy and the French farmers and that sort of thing so they were aware of the fact that they would have to overcome a lot of resistance along that line. Polish agriculture was pretty backward from what I could see. They could do certain things; grow cucumbers for pickles and some other speciality crops like that, they had a lot of mushrooms because they have that cool, wet climate. The grain I suppose would have been kind of redundant. I don't think there was any great need for it plus I think from what I saw of their agriculture, it was very inefficient. For instance, in 1990 about 30% of the population was still living in the country on farms compared to like 3-4% in Western Europe. It was a place extremely backward in that respect.There industrial plant was full of equally inefficient operations.

Q: Let's see, do you remember where wwere?

ANDERSON: Well we just finished talking about the European community and Polish desire to join it. I'm no expert on economic development by any means but Poland, I think like all the communist countries, had developed a huge, obsolete infrastructure. Industrial brontosauruses of all sorts and it was worse than being underdeveloped in a way because you had to get rid of all of this.

Q: And of course the huge steel mills and all employ a lot of people. As we know we tried to shut down obsolescent military bases it's hard. Politically it is very difficult.

ANDERSON: Well you know Poland and a lot of Eastern Europe in general was a rust belt you might say. You might compare it to Pittsburgh or Philadelphia or something like that because in a sense the industrial base was no longer really useful. It was inefficient and it couldn't compete.

Q:I would have thought it would have sent shocks waves of almost horror to seGermany unite back in 1990 or so when all of a sudden here the Soviet Union is imploding and all, but all of a sudden you get a new Germany.

ANDERSON: It was. One of the things I did follow very closely was the signing of an agreement recognizing the Oder-Neisse River line as the eastern frontier of Germany once again. I mean there seems to have been an agreement back in 1975 at the time of the CSCE conferences, but Poland wanted it reconfirmed by the new united German government.

Q: Helsinki Accords was a big deal for the Soviets but that's what they wanted and that's why they signed it.

ANDERSON: There was evidently something in it for them. I'm not too familiar with exactly what was in those Accords. No boundaries changed. The boundaries were to stay as they were and nobody was even to make a noise about revision of boundaries. Given the fact that the communists were no longer there, the idea was that Poland and Germany should do a bilateral thing now, the new Germany. In fact the border of Germany now had moved east because the Soviet sector, East Germany, no longer exists and the new Germany was no longer the FRG but actually Germany. The Poles wanted to nail down the fact that this border was inviolable and that the Germans accepted it. So they did the treaty and Skubiszewski who was the Polish foreign minister and the German foreign minister, Genscher, Helmut Kohl and Mazowiecki and negotiated and signed this treaty and that was a big, big deal for the Poles to give them a sense of security in that respect. As far as Germany was concerned it didn't seem to me, once the Cold War was over, I mean Germany had been viewed as one of the other bases of the Soviet Union really. 500,000 or however many Soviet troops were there plus the East German troops were also viewed as an invasion force by the Soviets. I don't know that it would have ever been used but it really blocked any possibility for Poland ever to be part of Europe. The disappearance of that and the movement of Soviet forces back to what was now Russia and I remember following, we used to follow closely the trains carrying Soviet troops back and ships and so on back to the Soviet Union or Russia eventually. The evacuation of all of those troops changed the strategic framework entirely. The Germany that emerged after the withdrawal of the Soviets and the end of the Cold War I wouldn't say it really posed much of a threat.

Q:I don't want to put words in your mouth, but they were still looking at revived Russia?

ANDERSON: Oh yes. The people I dealt with saw that the real threat was from Russia. It wasn't from Germany. There was a little bit of skinhead sort of fascism, neo-Nazism over in Germany. Surprisingly a lot of it in the eastern part of the country that popped up afterwards, anti-Polish you know. Of course still, thousands, millions maybe, of people who had been uprooted and sent back into Germany, the current Germany, formerly from Pomerania, East Prussia and all those people and their organization, which I'm not sure what it is called in German, but they posed a continuing kind of political threat.

Q: Did the creation of the enclave of Kalingrad, did that cause any problem while you were there?

ANDERSON: I remember one time we did a report on that as though that was somehow or another a sort of Damocles sword hanging over Poland because it was a Soviet enclave right there on their border because otherwise they had Belarus and then they had Ukraine so they didn't have a common border with Russia. It was one of those things you looked at and thought, gee this could be a problem. So far it hasn't turned out to be. It's more of a problem for Lithuania obviously since to get to it the Russians have to pass through Lithuania.

Q: It's also in a way a problem for Russia. I mean it's sort of a rusting out place.

ANDERSON: I don't know what is going to become of that area. Certainly this whole business of the Navy base that was there and so on. It seems to be one of those vestiges of the old system that are really not necessary any more. I don't know, they should just sell the whole thing to Lithuania and Poland and get out. But they never will I suppose.

Q: By the way, did the creation of Ukraine do anything in Poland, reaction to this, good, bad, indifferent?

ANDERSON: They did, I recall, some of the Solidarity people went down to help sort of steer Ukraine what they thought would be in the more constructive direction. There was no love lost between Ukrainians and Poles. Of course within Ukraine there was a huge difference between the western portion of the country and the more Russian portion of the eastern part of it and the Poles recognized that. On the border between Ukraine and Poland there was also a sense that Ukraine could be a problem for Poland. I mean on one hand Poland could help Ukraine but on the other hand Ukraine could drag Poland down in a sense because Ukraine could say, "Well we want to be part of Europe and we think we should be part of Europe" and of course Poland says "Wait a minute we're first and you guys are like dead weight, you're a big anchor. We don't want you vetoing or otherwise obstructing our movement to the west dragging us back." So there was this certain sense that Ukraine could be a sort of trap of some sort for them but I don't think that has materialized either.

Q: How did you find a contact as compared to when you were back there in the '70s? Contact with the Poles, I mean both social and official contacts.

ANDERSON: In 1979 to 1981 when I was there I don't recall any social contact with Poles. I think that was really still, any social contact you had would have been a problem. By 1990 when I got there, there were all kinds of Poles that we had contact with. My wife went to work for Price Waterhouse, that's where I got most of my contact with Poles, a lot of non-Poles as well at their consulting business there in Warsaw. She was actually an accountant, is an accountant and she was doing internal work within the office. She wasn't really doing consulting or anything. She was doing the books for the office itself, billings and all that. She did get to know a number of people working in the office, local folks, young people for the most part. We stayed in touch with them for some time. A lot of Polish, Anglo-Poles, and a lot of American Poles, or Polish Americans had come back to Poland by that time so we got to know some of those people. Although we spoke pretty good Polish, I think that it was still a bit of a language gap there so it was easier to get to know the bilingual people from England or from the United States who came back to Poland. In my work I had to deal and spend a lot of time with Polish politicians. The one guy, Andrzej Kern, he became sort of a personal friend. He was sort of like the Bruno Ferrari situation. I went to his home, he was from Lodz. So we went to Lodz. I don't think my wife came with me though. It was me and maybe one of the other guys from the embassy and we had dinner at their house. They had an apartment in one of the high rise buildings there and he showed us around Lodz. I went to Lodz again, a year or so later. It was the other large city in our consular district. In any case we covereLodz. Lodz, talk about rust belt, it was an old textile city. That was its major industry and it was really a mess. Kern, he had this daughter, very good looking girl, who was supposedly kidnapped or something and there was a big scandal about, oh she wasn't kidnapped, that her father had her kidnapped because he didn't like the boy she was hanging around with or something like that. I don't know what the devil it was all about. It became a kind of, hmmm, maybe we shouldn't be seeing each other so much. I didn't really want to be involved in any kind of criminal proceedings. I don't think it was true. I mean Andrzej probably, he had a tendency to drink too much sometimes and he may have done something stupid like that, I don't know. The thing is, no harm was really done. I think she was 17. She wasn't really of an age to, she was still under his authority. Stuff like that would happen there.

With one group of parliamentarians I went on a trip. I had one of these NATO tours which were sponsored by USIA and the idea was to, we had them down in Italy too. The U.S. government was paying money to ship members of, parliamentarians and so on from various NATO member countries or would be NATO member countries, like Poland, to visit NATO installations, get a briefing there in Brussels and we went also to the CFE talks in Vienna where they were signing some kind of a document. It was a bit of a boondoggle, but I went all the way around. One of the guys on there was the leader of the senate foreign relations committee. A fellow named Maciej Szymanski. Just before we were going, we had this thing arranged, we have to work on these things months in advance, and so a week or so before the thing was supposed to take off, he was indicted or at least accused. I'm not sure if it was an actual indictment but he looked like he might be or would soon be indicted for some kind of embezzlement of campaign funds or some other kind of funds. I'm not sure what had happened. Everybody knew, well, okay we know the guy is a little sleazy, but a lot of politicians are sleazy. It doesn't mean that you don't have, especially at the embassy right, we don't look upon this, this is a domestic problem. He is still the head of the Foreign Affairs Committee and he was a very appropriate person to have on this NATO tour. But some of the other members of the tour started say, "We don't want to be seen with this guy." Well, we patched it together, I don't know, maybe one or two of them dropped out so we picked up another. Any case, I led this group around and mainly they were interested, it seemed like when we got to the United Kingdom they wanted all to go into the PX and buy stuff you know. Sightseeing and so on. It was fun. Zbigniew Romaszewski, the human rights activist, the one was the one that I was at his house you know when the Secret Police were doing the search back in the old days, 1981 I guess. He and his wife had sort of lost a little bit of their stature. They were big when there was an underground and that sort on thing. Once it became a public business of running for office and all that, he came across I suppose as a bit oa pointy headed intellectual and he wasn't as attractive, he didn't look like a politician, which he really wasn't. Even so he was elected to the Senate, which was kind of an honorific body. So those were the kind of people and then some younger folks too. I ended up selling my car to one of them before I left.

Q: When you left there in 1993, then were did you go?

ANDERSON: I went for two years to the Coast Guard Academy in New London to teach. I taught history and foreign affairs.

Q: How did you find the Coast Guard Academy?

ANDERSON: Well, it's a lovely place. It was a little bit incestuous there I would say. The Coast Guard is a very, very closed community, at least the part of it that I saw.They were suffering from terrific funding problems. Their budget had been cut way back. It's interesting that now of course they are just being inundated with money since now they are part of Homeland Security but in those days Department of Transportation is where they were located and they were not well funded. So of course their school was, and most of, I would say 80-90% of Coast Guard officers come out of the Coast Guard Academy unlike the other services which produce 50% at most of their officer corp. So the Coast Guard Academy is almost like a fraternity house or something. It's a place where everybody passes through there and they come back, some of them to teach. But that is not considered a very promising career. Most of them want to be, have a sea command of some sort and go on to become admirals or something. I didn't have anything in common with these people being a kind of liberal Democrat and most of them were pretty hard right type folks. I suppose they all drove SUV's and carried a gun when they were at home or something, I don't know. They're more like tough cops, is what I would call them. Less military and more police I would say is the kind of mentality I found there.

Q: How did you find sort of your liberal approach to history and all that? How was it received?

ANDERSON: I don't think I conveyed that in the classroom very much. My approach to teaching and of course I never really taught before, certainly not on a college level. I did two years as a junior high school teacher, in quotation marks. So I took the approach, since it was a survey course in U.S. history, I think it was just one semester we were supposed to cover all U.S. history, that they should be learning kind of the facts. I wasn't interested in too much blabber, sitting around talking about current events or whatever, which of course in American today that is considered the way to deal with students. You don't want to give them any kind of rote learning. You want to make it as mushy-brained as possible. In any case, I took the line that here's the chapter, here's the questions on that chapter. You have to know the answers to these questions and I'll test you on them. A lot of times they didn't know the answers so I lot of them didn't do very well. It wasn't as though I said well I was very objective. I gave multiple choice tests. I had them write essays of course for their finals and most of them did pretty well I guess. I didn't in other words conform probably to what was considered good teaching practice in a lot of ways. Of course for them this was a required course. Most of them wanted to go into engineering or marine science or something, whatever they take in a way of getting into their career track. There were a few who were going into what's called public policy. I think the department that I taught in was history and public policy and we had some people teaching political science there. I also taught two courses, one on Modern Europe, the current situation in Europe and one called the Foreign Policy Process. It was more like a seminar really. I think I had only about eight or nine students in it. They were juniors and seniors. I enjoyed it very much.I did a case studies approach on the Foreign Policy Process and went back and looked at decisions, more recent I guess. I had one on the Chinese, most favored nation status for China or revoking it or renewing it I guess it was in the early 1990s which was a big issue. One about what happened in the Philippines when the Corazon Aquino government came in or when Marcos was overthrown I guess in 1988 or so and how the Regan administration dealt with that because they really didn't know what was going to happen next. The role of public opinion, the role of congress, the role of pressure groups, the role of the press. I sort of had it divided up schematically about six or seven different players on every foreign policy decision, State Department to congress, the president, how each one of them got involved in the decision-making process. I wrote a couple of case studies, on those two Philippines and most-favored nation status for China. I wrote two case studies and I said, "Okay, here's what I'm talking about and I want you to do," and they had to select another foreign policy decision. There had to be a decision, there had to be a crisis almost or some kind of decision and how that was handled. Each one of them had to write a paper on that. I really enjoyed that. I don't know if they did or not. I got a lot out oit.

Q: Why did you take this job?

ANDERSON: My career was not exactly as we say headed towards the stars and I was looking toward a post-Foreign Service career of some sort and I thought, well one way to burnish my credentials, I have a PhD in history, one way to show that I'm capable of teaching history is to actually take this. That will look good on my resume when I then go to look for a teaching job. That was my primary motivation. Plus I just love to teach history. I love history.

Q: When then, well we're talking about 1995.

ANDERSON: 1993 to 1995 I was there.

Q: And then what did you do?

ANDERSON: Well, I went to Urdu language training for a year and then to Pakistan.

Q: You were in Pakistan from what 1996 to?

ANDERSON: 1998.

Q: What were you doing in Pakistan?

ANDERSON: I was just doing the same thing I always did which was domestic political reporting. I supposedly spoke Urdu but I never got more than a 1 plus 2 or something after 11 months of Urdu. But everybody that I dealt with spoke pretty good English and I had a guy with me all the time to do my interpreting.

Q: What was the situation when you got there in 1996 in Pakistan?

ANDERSON: The Benazir Bhutto government was kind of controversial and there was a danger that is was going to be, lose an election and be replaced by a Nawaz Sharif government. I think I got there in the summer of 1996 and the election must have taken place in about October and Bhutto was actually defeated. The Pakistan Muslim League Party was the one that won the election. The Peoples Party was defeated so Nawaz Sharif came back in. I think he had been prime minister before. Bhutto was out. The problem with the Bhutto government I suppose had a lot to do with the perception of corruption. Her husband Asif Zardari, who is still rattling around over there; I see he was just let out of jail but now he may be going back, had been known as Mr. 10%. Anybody who wanted to import anything into Pakistan had to pay him 10% fee on their imports. He was supposedly amassing a huge fortune, living like a king. She, Bhutto, herself, was popular among the people down in the Sindh where she grew up. Her family was from that area but they were not that popular over in Punjab, which was Nawaz Sharif's stomping ground.

In1996 we had a pretty good relationship with Pakistan although we had cut off any kind of aid, so I guess we couldn't call the relationship too good. No foreign aid or military assistance because since 1990, I believe, since they had an uninspected or uncontrolled nuclear program which eventually was going to result just before I left there in the detonation of their first nuclear weapon. I think about May or June of 1998. Bilaterally I thought we were in pretty good shape. Nawaz Sharif came in and the first thing he did was to clamp down on weddings. He said that the people were spending too much money on weddings so he decided to place a limit on that. The guy, I don't know where he is today, but he was a little bit of a kook you know. He was living a sheltered existence. He was the son of a relatively rich father I think. His father had some kind of a business that made shoes or something like that. They had amassed over the years a large fortune. He lived in a big compound down outside of Lahore. It's eventually going to become a scandal and one of the reasons he was overthrown, because again, like Bhutto, they were siphoning off millions and millions of dollars and he was building this place. I think it had a wall around it. It's funny because we never heard about this while I was in Pakistan, but after I left all these revelations came out. That's when Nawaz and Musharraf had this confrontation and Musharraf wouldn't allow them to land or something like that. Maybe it was Musharraf they wouldn't allow to land, I can't remember what it was. In any case, the overthrow oNawaz Sharif's government in 1998 took place after I left. Most of the time I was there Nawaz Sharif was the prime minister. He was trying to install people that were sort of more Islamic I guess. He pretended that he was the defender of thIslamic faith I suppose in Pakistani politics whereas Bhutto was much more secular, westernized. They may have both been educated in England. She definitely was western educated and very westernized. As you might expect, a woman in Pakistan, with that kind of power, well it's a rather precarious position to be in. NawaSharif was a little bit detached from reality I would say. He had all these crazy ideas. Like for instance, one of his big things in his previous administration had been the yellow taxi cab campaign. He figured the way to defeat poverty in Karachi and elsewhere was to help these guys, and there was a need for taxis. The government was going to subsidize the purchase of taxis. I don't know, maybe he owned part of the taxi company or something. They had thousands, hundreds anyhow, of taxis that were sold at very, very low prices to people in Karachi and elsewhere, maybe Lahore; wherever they had a market for them. These guys then would start their little businesses and they were supposedly going to, I don't think it amounted to anything, but then he was noted for his yellow taxis. Then he wanted to build a super highway. Pakistan never had, I mean its roads were just a disaster. It looked like there had been a war because they were all filled with craters, they weren't just potholes, but they were craters and trucks had to drive around them and if it was dark and you fell into one of those things, you're dead. So he built this expressway. It was in his first administration that he started it and then Bhutto came in and he had to stop. Then he came back and he finished it. It runs from Islamabad or outside olslamabad down to Lahore, which is the distance of about 150 miles I guess. It was built by a Korean firm which they paid a lot of money to. It's not exactly regulation in terms of some of the hills are very steep and some of the curves are very sharp, but compared to any other road in Pakistan it's certainly a great improvement. The thing is most Pakistanis don't have cars, they don't drive at high speeds and the road was always empty. I think we drove down there, down to Lahore a couple of times and other intermediate points. You could drive for miles and not see another car on the darn thing. I guess it had a toll. You had to pay a toll. That's another reason nobody used it. It was like building a castle in the desert or something. It was just really a waste of money. He had other ideas about how he was going to modernize the country and so on.

Then he appointed a guy as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court there who was really, he looked like an old, kind of imam from the village or something. He had a little beard here. He was considered a throw back to some earlier era and nobody could figure out why he brought him in. I guess it was just cover. He just wanted to have somebody in there he could say, "See how close I am to the Muslin fundamentalist", or whatever this guy represented. I guess the guy was also close to Nawaz and Nawaz felt he could control him. It created a huge brew ha, ha about that. I don't know exactly how that all worked out. What you found was that Nawaz Sharif, and I find this true of quite a few politicians, he had a very, very strange agenda, you know what I mean. He didn't seem to recognize or see what the real problems were there and he wasn't addressing them and of course a lot of problems that were really, serious problems, economic problems, problems with these crazy terrorists of one sort or another, the Shiite-Sunni conflict that was going on. All the mess that was going on in Pakistan, he never really addressed those things at all. He was off dealing with what I would call his own little personal ideas. As a result people got a little tired of him. It became clear that this guy, he was never going to get around to dealing with the real problems. He didn't seem to know about them or really care about them. Then it became known that he was enriching himself and his family and everybody else. Huge sums of money were flowing into his coffers and he was overthrown.

Q: Our relations I take it were not really terribly good if we were cutting off all sorts of aid, military and all that?

ANDERSON: Well, yeah it had been like that since 1990, and no, there was no strategic reason for us, after the overthrow of the Soviets and Afghanistan, this is really where it all goes back to. Of course the Pakistanis resented the fact that we had been great friends with them when we needed them as a base for operations against the Soviets, but then once that was taken care of we just cut them off so that wrangled.

Q: What was the situation along the border, near the Khyber Pass and that area at the time?

ANDERSON: Of course the Taliban had succeeded in grabbing control of most of Afghanistan by 1997 or so and they were supported by the Pakistani, what do they call it, ISI or their Inter-Services Intelligence Agency. It's interesting because it had the same initials as the International School of Islamabad and they finally changed the International School of Islamabad to something else because they said "Oh, we can't have this ISI, it's too controversial," once it became clear that that was one of the major funders and supporters of the Taliban. Just as they had been and still are perhaps, supporting the mujahideen over in Kashmir. The thing about Pakistan is that you've got a government and then you've got all these other organizations that are operating there without any government control. You can talk to the government, but that doesn't mean that they really, you never had the sense that the government was really in charge of Pakistan, of what was going on. Maybe, periodically and sporadically there would be an assertion of governmental authority in various parts of the country, but in the meantime there would be long periods during which many parts of the country where the government was really not asserting any authority in those areas and that would of course apply to that area along the border with Afghanistan; the so called tribal areas. Those places were under the control of local warlords and figures of various sorts. They ran things in their own area and the government had very little to say about it or was really not interested as long as they, whatever, paid their taxes or whatever it was the government wanted out of it. Of course that was clear from just the fact that the infrastructure was a total disaster, since the British times, it didn't look like they had done anything. It was just run down to almost nothing. The railroads and roads were just absolutely almost impassable. To me there was no sense, in other words that there was a functioning government in much of Pakistan. It was really on the verge at any given time of collapse. Then what often happens when there is such weakness, is that in order to assert themselves when they strike out, they use excessive violence to deal with disturbances and so on. They go and machine gun a bunch of people. You get the picture. It was a failed state. It still is as far as I'm concerned. It never held together really, as a unified country. Punjabis and Sindhis and Baluchis and the Pashtuns and so on, all speak their own languages. The local feelings are very strong. There is very little sense that central authority is going to do them any good. The only thing, I guess you could say that holds it together even a little bit, is the army, but it can't be everywhere. In fact, the army has its own internal divisions, like this ISI thing. There is definitely an area of the army that, to me anyhow, is kind of outside of anybody's control which is a law onto itself. It was pretty chaotic.

Q: Who was the ambassador when you were there?

ANDERSON: Tom Simons again. I don't know if he was happy to see me there or not but there we were. Just a coincidence. I had no idea, neither did he.

Q: How did you operate? Was there a parliament that made any sense to make contact with?

ANDERSON: There were members of parliament that I did see. The parliament, well yes, I mean it met once in awhile and just had long winded debates and really didn't have too much effective power. I travelled around the country quite a bit with Amman Khan who was the chief local in the political section. Amman and I would travel to visit with the various local notables and so on. They had all these different titles.There was this old pre-independence ruling class there, the ones the British cultivated. They still saw themselves as kind of, well they had been overtaken by events I suppose, they didn't really have that much control but they were still in many instances in the countryside. You had the local notables and you'd go and see them and they owned huge quantities of land and the people who worked on that land were pretty much serfs. They owned vast tracts of land. One guy, a Nawab, I went with somebody from the consulate in Lahore. I can't remember. It was down on the border. I'm sure these kind of people exist in all parts of the world but he was on the border with India. It was in the area of Bahawalpur. He had a private plane and he flew down there and back. We met up in Lahore and he flew us down there in his private plane.He was a pretty good pilot but he didn't really trust himself so he actually sat as co-pilot and an American guy who really knew how to fly the plane, which I was happy to see, handled the controls most of the time. Me and the guy from the consulate sat in the back. He flew down there. He had his own air strip right next to his home there. We drove around, spent the day at these various palaces and so on. Took us out and showed us the desert by night and said out there is a big castle, palace of some sort in the desert. It's kind of interesting and the thing is that I feel these people are pretty irrelevant to what is going on. In other words you've got an old ruling class that really does not take any interest in running the state affairs and then you've got this new ruling class, sort of these politicians who are totally opportunists as best I can tell, have no interest in the state. There is no working class, no labor unions. There is nothing that would sort of form a kind of organized, mass political movement of any sort. There's the religious aspect, the Muslim League and Bhutto with his Peoples Party did create a kind of personal following and that was good. Really in the final analysis, really all there is is the army.

Q: Were we paying any attention to the, madrassa schools and also this very fundamentalist, very anti-American movement that was going on?

ANDERSON: Not enough evidently. We certainly did not have a good grasp of the depth of the anti-Americanism there. Most of that of course was centered in Afghanistan with Bin Laden. The Taliban were such a strange medieval phenomenon. My office mate, Joe Novak used to go up to Afghanistan a couple of times a month. He would fly in with the Red Cross plane and so on. They had an aid program there and he'd fly into Kabul or into Kandahar, some of these other places. Even off to Mazar e Sharif. At that time there was an ongoing war of the northern forces against the Taliban and this had been going for several years and then the Taliban eventually pushed those people way back into the mountains and took control of Kabul. That all happened within that two year period I was there. I could see it going on then. I was not directly involved in it. The Taliban, I didn't really cover them. I think that was mainly a kind of intelligence agency operation since we assumed that those folks were all potential terrorists I guess. We knew about it but I guess in a sense we thought, oh well, that's not our problem. The thing is the money for them was coming from the Saudis, it still is I suppose. Gosh, if you want to find a hate-filled religious training center, go to Saudi Arabia, you don't have to go to Pakistan. There wasn't a single Pak who was in one of those terrorist camps, they're not terrorists, they may have been a few who eventually appeared as Al Qaeda reps but I would say 99% of the Pakistanis are not anti-American. They've never seen us as the great Satan.

Q: Could you travel around or were we concerned about personal security?

ANDERSON: No, I travelled everywhere and mainly the thought was, oh gee, you shouldn't be out on the road at night because there are bandits down in Sindh especially in Sukkur. There was a terrorist threat because in fact we did have a number of alerts. Bin Laden's name was mentioned. He said he's going to get us and that sort of thing so we should be careful. In terms of travel, I suppose people thought you're probably more likely to be shot on your way to work than you are out travelling around the countryside because your path was well known. Like I say, we travelled around Punjab and Sindh more than any place else. Those were the most populous areas. I went once over to visit where my cook and house guy lived in Kashmir. A lot of the people from Kashmir had come down into Islamabad for jobs. So I had a four wheel drive car and a driver, I actually hired the driver from the embassy and he took us up there one weekend to this Rawalkot is the name of the town which was sort of hanging on the side of a mountain there; a steep valley in Kashmir. We found a funny little hotel there that we stayed in and then went to visit him up at his house which was even further out of town. So I travelled there. I remember at that hotel that the guy who was the owner of the hotel, I don't think they got many Americans staying there. There was me and two interns who had come, two summer interns I took with me. We were sitting there at the table in the dining room of the hotel, so called, and he came out and you know he said, "Well, I don't hate Americans, no. It's just some of the things they do." In other words, he protested too much, immediately. I said, "Oh, okay, then we will just be on our way." In other words, underneath the surface I do think that there was a great deal of anti-American feeling, especially in a place like Kashmir where perhaps they blamed us for the fact that the Indians were still fighting them and they weren't able to take over that area. They blamed us for Israel and they blamed us for anything that was wrong with their lives. It basically came down to that. You can see that America became, for a lot of people, an obsession, no doubt about it. It wouldn't matter that there was no factual basis to most of the problems that they attributed or most of the nastiness and so on in the world that they attributed to us. It had nothing to do with us, but the fact that being who we are, we're the ones who are going to be blamed.

Q: Well the Brits use to get this and now it's our turn.

ANDERSON: I guess so. It's the price you pay, I guess for being number one if you will and that's the way it was.

Q: What about India and Kashmir, did that play much of a role?

ANDERSON: It's an interesting relationship certainly. The Indians of course have a High Commission there in Islamabad. That is what they call their embassy. They are both members of the Commonwealth you know. In the capital oPakistan there is an Indian embassy, a big Indian embassy and a lot of Pakistanis just love to go to India because they can speak the language there, not just English but also Urdu.Of course there are millions of Urdu speakers in India so they feel kind of at home there. They view India as, they have a love-hate relationship with India I suppose. They view it, almost they envy it. There's freedom, the color, the good-looking women, the movies. In other words it's like going to Las Vegas or something. They view it as sin city down there. At the same time you can see, especially the male portion of the Pakistani population, that to them India is an object of desire you know. They go there to have a good time. Then on a more sophisticated level the journalists and some of them recognize that India is a free country with a democratic press or free press and they respect that and they kind of want to emulate that. The military, I guess, I didn't speak to them much about it, but they come out of the same roots. In fact many of the people in India who are in the military are probably Muslims too. So this is a strange relationship that they have with India. It's almost like a civil war in a sense, still. You go down to the frontier, outside of Lahore. I don't know what it is called there, it's a changing of the guard that they have there every day. We went down there and took that in.

Q:Both the Indians and Pakistanis go to great lengths to put on a show don't they?

ANDERSON: Yeah, the military flourishes and all that sort of thing. They really do. They sort of march like that, you know. I guess they're trying to, it's almost like fighting cocks you know, prancing around. I don't think we understand that relationship. It's not a relationship that Americans would really be able to get into. It's too, I'd say incestuous or something. I'm not sure if it will ever settle down. Of course there is a lot of nastiness about Hinduism. They don't like Hinduism. They figure it's dirty. A polytheistic thing and of course they would always tell you, "Oh Ghandi drank his own urine." They always think that is something you should know. They feel that the Indians are dirty, that a lot of the religious aspect of it is unclean. It's interesting because Pakistan is a sewer you know. It's an absolute pit of sewage and a mess of all sorts. Any of their towns or cities, I call it plasticbagistan because there are plastic bags everywhere, in the trees, in the gutters. Everything is sold in these God awful little plastic bags. It's just ghastly. It stinks. You get off the plane, like I suppose almost any third world country, it takes a while to get used to the smell. So the idea that they should look down their nose at India as being an unclean place, I think is absolutely ludicrous. But it doesn't make it any less true.

Q: Well then it's probably a good place to stop. In 1998 you left Pakistan wither?

ANDERSON: I came back here and worked at the Board of Examiners.

Q: All right why don't we finish with that.

ANDERSON: OK.

Q: Today is May 18, 2005. Mike, 1998 you went to the Board of Examiners. How long did you do that?

ANDERSON: Two years.

Q: So 1998 to 2000.

ANDERSON: Yes.

Q: How did you feel about that assignment?

ANDERSON: You know, I was looking towards retirement and one of the ideas I had was to go into college teaching and I thought maybe one of the aspects of working on the Board of Examiners would be going out recruiting, dealing with people coming out of college and so on. It would also give me a chance to get acquainted a little bit with the academic world. It didn't quite work out that way, but that's how I was viewing it. I was interested in the examination process.

Q: I did it for a year. I enjoyed it very much. How was the process when you were doing it? What were you doing in the examining process?

ANDERSON: Well, we did the oral exams and so we saw applicants who had passed the written exam and were coming in. Most of them came into Washington. I guess I had one trip or two trips really, to San Francisco. We did people from the West Coast and some from the Far East who had come from foreign work assignments in Japan or elsewhere had come to San Francisco. These were young people for the most part. Highly qualified I would say. The exam process was looking as them really more for their personality and I guess sort of psychological testing you might say rather than academic or intelligence testing. So it was interesting. I'd never done anything like that before. Posing these hypothetical situations and then seeing how they reacted.

Q: What was your impression? What type of things would sort of separate the sheep from the goats?

ANDERSON: I don't know. I think the one thing that impressed me is a person who is confident as opposed to somebody who was hesitant or lacking in any sense of conviction about what they were going to do. Sometimes I think that really comes across better. It's not much the correctness of your response,. There was not necessarily, there certainly wasn't one correct way to deal with the problems that were posed. I was always more impressed by individuals who sort of took the bull by the horns and dealt with it rather than hesitating, hemming and hawing, going down one road about half way then turning around and coming back and then trying something else. So in a sense it was a little bit unfair I think to those people who are more contemplative, who like to think a problem through a lot. It really favored that individual who was quick on his or her feet and able to make a decisive, rational decision in a short amount of time. I think that was what we were looking for too in many instances.

Q: Well, when I was on it I sort of counselled co-workers after and that was exactly what I w as looking for. I was not looking for somebody that could over think something.They had to make decisions. Did you know much about the background of the people or was this carefully kept from you?

ANDERSON: No, we didn't. When I was doing it they were just names on a sheet of paper. WE didn't have anything information about them. In fact, if we knew anything about the person, we were supposed to recuse from the proceedings. We were supposed to just turn it over to somebody else.

Q: Did you remember anmemorable instances or anything like that when you were dointhis?

ANDERSON: Not right off hand. I mean as it turned out sometimes people didn't come through. One situation that arose that was, it didn't affect me directly, was a man that I had joined the Foreign Service with a guy who had reached the end of his career and had been, I guess selected out, or whatever you call it, after 30 years or so.

Q: Time and class.

ANDERSON: Time and class. He was in the senior Foreign Service. A real smart guy, but he didn't have anything, any other kind of idea about what he wanted to do in life. He just wanted to be a Foreign Service officer. So after he was out of the service, he reapplied as a junior officer and lo and behold he comes in one day to take the oral exam. When I saw has name, and I don't think I was on the, we saw all the people that were coming in that day and there I saw his name. I had to say, "My God, you know this is incredible." Of course eventually he passed the oral exam and he went back to work with the State Department as a junior officer. It was one of the more remarkable incidents during my two years there. Then of course we had many people who I thought were unqualified. They came in I think, many of them, just on a whim so to speak. You pass the exam, and you know this is what young people do. You're looking for a job but you're not quite sure what it is.

Q: Many of our colleagues came in exactly that way. It wasn't my absolute ambition, I just gave it a try.

ANDERSON: Yeah and of course sometimes that works and other times it was clear that these folks were not really, either not serious or they were not really up to the job. So the hardest part was dealing with those who had been failed, if you will, from the oral and they had to be brought in and sat down and we have this little song and dance that we use. Actually you read something out of a book practically. You can't go into any detail about their performance or anything. You just have to tell them that they didn't make it. Wish them well and all that sort of thing and a handshake and that was it. It was always kind of sad. I can't remember any people breaking down in tears or anything, but I'm sure a few of them did afterwards. Others were totally blasï¿½ about it. It was an interesting procedure but I wasn't quite sure that it was the answer to finding Foreign Service officers, but I guess it was one possibility. It had been used for a long time.

Q: Again and again, they revamp the system. They try to do two things. One to make sure that the system was absolutely fair or at least free from being sued and the other one was almost secondary to find absolutelperfect Foreign Service officers. I know that's the theory, anyway, because there is no one type that does well.

ANDERSON: It's a tribute really to the Foreign Service that we do have such a diverse crowd of people who are part of it. I think, historically, like any diplomatic service, it was an elitist group probably up through the Second World War, maybe up through the 1950s and 1960s. I'm not sure exactly when it started to change.

Q: About a year ago. It's probably like so many things.

ANDERSON: Yeah, it opened the doors for a lot of people.

Q: I came in in 1955. By that time, I mean people still were kind of appointed so they end up in certain places, but they're coming from a much greater variety of backgrounds because of the GI bill.

ANDERSON: Oh, okay.That's true. I hadn't thought of that but that certainly opened the doors of education, higher education to a lot of people and then I suppose that the ideas of the 1960s and opening, diversifying everything, women and minorities of all sorts who hadn't previously even been given a thought as to being a part of the Foreign Service, now are going to become very much a part of it. In fact, I would say, probably half of the applicants that we looked at were women which of course, 20 or 30 years before would have been unheard of. So it was interesting. It got a little old after a while and we had about a one year period where we were down. We really weren't doing any interviews. They had, evidently they didn't have money to bring people in or something like that. I can't even remember what the circumstances were and we moved from one office to another, from Rosslyn over to Columbia Plaza. There was almost a year where we didn't do a single oral interview, oral exam. Of course I was twiddling my thumbs a large part of the time. We did have some other things that we did. We reviewed written exams and made suggestions for changes to the questions and that sort of thing and some other stuff but it was a highly inefficient procedure or process in terms of the manpower that was being utilized or not utilized for that long period of time. A lot of these people were senior Foreign Service officers drawing big salaries and they were basically doing nothing. The amount of money wasted on the thing was quite striking, but I guess that's the way it goes.

Q: Did you feel, while you were actually doing interviews and all, by the time you were doing it recruiting women was no longer an issue. I mean they were coming in in sufficient numbers, but what about minorities? Particularly African Americans for the most part, was there pressure to bend the rules, to pass people, did you feel that at all?

ANDERSON: No. The guy who was the head of the examining office, the director of the office, the second year I was there was black. I do think they were making a real effort to show a diverse face to the public. In fact most blacks were, at least black males were not interested in the Foreign Service. They either didn't take the written exam or if they did and they passed it they didn't come in for the oral. We saw very few black males and very few black females for that matter. We were more likely to see an Asian or a south Asian or somebody like that. I'm not sure why, but for whatever reason the Foreign Service has not really been very much of a draw for minorities, especially for African Americans.

Q: Well then in 2000 what did you do?

ANDERSON: In 2000 I went to the Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Operations office, since renamed, of IO and I spent two years there.

Q: Back to the Board of Examiners, you made your trips around, you were saying you did some recruitment trips.. What was your impression of the interest on campuses ithe Foreign Service with the people you talked to?

ANDERSON: I didn't really do that much. I did a little bit here in the District of Columbia area. We did some job fairs, again aimed at the black population more than anything.What we had done in our recruitment was to lump together Foreign Service officer recruitment, whatever you want to call it, and the staff and various specialities and so on, all into one big crowd. Well, that's very nice but there is a huge difference obviously between what you need to do to get into the Foreign Service as an officer and what you need to get into it as a computer, IT person or something. They're not the same thing at all. I think I felt a little out of place doing that. I was talking to people who would be employed in support positions, we really had a big push to get IT people.

Q: IT meaning?

ANDERSON: Information technology people into the Foreign Service because there was a big need for it and I think that there was terrific competition in the private sector at that time so that the availability was way down. Those people we did have, a lot of them were skipping and going over to the private sector because they could make a lot more money. So that was a big push that we had on. Now in terms of talking to college students who were interested in naturally going to the DiplomatiService as opposed to the staff or support services. It was primarily young women who would be interested in that.The guys, first of all I don't think the money that the ForeigService offered, government service in general, was appealing to, I don't know for whatever reason the young people, and maybe it's still true, but it was true a few years ago, they've got dollar signs in their eyes. They want to make millions. They're not interested in public service. They want to get rich and they want to have a glamorous, high status kind of existence and I don't think, you know there was a time when the Foreign Service had a kind of an appeal, maybe it was a cold war thing, you know, be a CIA spy and of course a lot of people don't even make a distinction between the CIA and the State Department. In their minds everybody is a CIA person. But that's gone. After the cold war that glamour angle I would say is gone. Maybe it still exists to a certain extent for people going into the CIA, but the State Department, you know this long twilight war against the Soviets and all that or the crusade against communism is over, so therefore people were looking more towards private sector employment.So it made it kind of hard to get your top college graduates. Although I noticed that they loved to come in to the State Department as interns. Evidently that had a lot of cache, to have that on your CV that you spent a summer at the State Department as an intern. I looked over a lot of the intern applicants and they seemed to all be from very, very prestigious schools, from people who really probably intended to go into some investment banking or some other kind ohighly paid profession but do want to have this kind of on their record that they did this internship at the State Department.

Q: Okay, well then you went over to the Bureau of International Organizations?

ANDERSON: Yes.

Q: From what 2000 to?

ANDERSON: 2002. I retired out of there in September, actually July of 2002.

Q: You said peacekeeping, what was your slice of the pie?

ANDERSON: I did the United Nations mission in the Congo called MONUC. MONUC stands for Mission Organizatione Nations Unie en Congo. That's what they called it: MONUC.

Q: What was it doing?

ANDERSON: Well, there had been a long drawn out civil war with a lot of external involvement in Congo in which millions presumably had died. Not so much as direct casualties of the war but as people who died of disease or malnutrition, what have you. I guess they had negotiated some kind of cease fire before I got there.The question was whether the UN would be sending in a peacekeeping mission and this was still kind of up in the air.It seemed to me the mission really started when I got there. I'm not quite sure. I remember when I joined the office it wasn't even clear whether there would be a peacekeeping mission but then, yes, they did send peacekeepers and I think by the time I left there were some 10,000 UN peacekeepers in the Congo. There was really a French lead on the thing. I suppose we were very much supportive. This started during the last year of the Clinton administration and then continued during, I mean I was there during the first year or so of the Bush administration. The overlap seemed to be moving pretty smoothly. Secretary of State Powell was very supportive of course trying to bring peace to the Congo, to try and do something about the tensions between Rwanda and the Congo and Rwanda and Burundi and all of that that had been going on. Because of the terrific genocide that had taken place back there in 1994 I believe it was with hundreds of thousands of people killed in Rwanda. .

Q: I think they were the Hutus that killed so many Tutsis and then when they were expelled they went back into the Congolese territory where they were regrouping.

ANDERSON: They had, yeah, I don't know whatever group, it was the minority, the Tutsis were the minority there. They were the ones who of course had been the victims of the slaughter of the genocide but were very much more, it seemed anyhow, sophisticated people, more educated and they were the ones who had taken control there in Rwanda. Then over in Congo when I first arrived there was Lawrence Kabila who was the head of the thing. Kabila was sort of a poor man'Napoleon, I guess, or something like that. He was really a butcher. So he was assassinated by some guard troops or something and his son, Joseph came in and Joseph still is there in charge of that country. He is quite a bit more gentle I guess than his father was. Then the question is well, what is U.S. involvement here, what is U.S. interest in this thing. Very, very little I would say but we did pay a huge sum of money in order to maintain this very expensive mission in Congo and I guess that was the thing. We were very, very concerned about the escalating cost of it. So I mean it was doing a lot of papers about what the future of this thing looks like, what our position should be and each one of the resolutions as they come up for continuation for expansion, and it had to be renewed about every six months, the mandate that they were operating under there. So that gave us a pretty steady work load in covering that.

Q: By the time you left in 2002 how were things?

ANDERSON: In Congo?

Q: Yeah.

ANDERSON: Seems to me they were on the road to a cease fire and some kind of general agreement. There were a lot of rebel groups that Kabila was fighting against and I think one of the key rebel groups, whose names I don't remember, had agreed to form a coalition with the government. There had been some kind, maybe there had been an election, I can't remember. Another group in the eastern part of Congo was supposedly, I mean according to various sources, under the influence of the Rwandans and was not going to be cooperative. So Kabila I think still is trying to get a hold of and get control of the eastern part of the Congo. The fighting evidently had tapered off and there appeared to be some kind of a movement toward a coalition government. I never went out to Congo. My successor did. I must say the thought of going to the Congo did not appeal to me. What could I do? I suppose it would be like an orientation visit. Go out and look at it.

Q: You didn't feel you could go out and wave your hands and speak and peace would arrive?

ANDERSON: No. I didn't see that my presence there would be anything other than maybe just an encumbrance to the people on the ground who were trying to do their jobs. But the guy who succeeded me did go out there and I think he was a little bit more familiar with African affairs. I'd never done anything on Africa before, so this was all new to me. We worked with the African Bureau of State. They haa weekly get together dealing with the Congo situation bringing in people from the White House and various other parts of the administration; the bureaucracy - State, Defense, etc.- every week and we'd get a briefing from a military guy who would say this is going on here and this is going on there.Sort of give us an overview of the thing. Then the latest cables from the various embassies would be gone through by, and I don't know the man's name, he had been, it was an Armenian name. He had been our ambassador in either Somalia or Ethiopia. Big tall guy. In any case, he would go through this stuff very effectively. Very, very brisk kind of approach and brief everybody on the latest developments. Go around the room, everybody would have a chance to say a few words. So I mean it was a big thing for the African Bureau to sort of have this thing going on. On the other hand, and the INR guys would also say quite a bit. They were very knowledgeable about the various tribal conflicts so I learned a lot in those meetings. It was like a seminar. I put in a few cents about what was going on in the Security Council in New York on this situation because actually I suppose that's where the leading, sort of decision makers were. Richard Holbrook or whoever and then his successor whose name escapes me. I'm not sure that he had a successor right away. They had somebody on the Security Council, one of our reps there who took that over. I remember meeting him once, but he didn't seem to have a whole lot of knowledge about, unfortunately a lot of the people who had expert knowledge on this thing were sort of, suffered from I guess localitis or something. They knew everything about it but they didn't know anything about what U.S. policy was. They had an idea as to what U.S. policy should be but it was driven more by their sympathy or feelings about the horrors of the situation than it was about anything having to do with real U.S. interest in the situation. Consequently, there was a certain amount of tension there. When the Bush administration came in I had the feeling that they were not focusing at all on Africa. Susan Rice who was the Assistant Secretary, very close to the Clintons, was replaced of course and I don't know who else, there was a woman from the NSC who came in. She was in the Bush NSC and was brought over to be Assistant Secretary. You know you saw a lot of that going on. To see a change in administrations from Democrat to Republican is not a pretty picture obviously or vice versa. I suppose because there is just an awful lot of blood on the floor. A lot of dishonesty, a lot of hypocrisy in other words justifying this, that and the other thing, but it's really politics. I've seen that before when I came back in 1981 after the Reagan administration had come in after Carter and saw the imposition really of a new regime on the State Department. Conservative Republicans had never considered the State Department to be under control. Always thought of it as a kind of nest of liberal Democrats I guess. So the attempt was made. Then we had Jessie Helms of course as the head of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for a number of years. He had a very, very jaundiced view of the State Department, so all of that came through of course in the policy mill. There was a lot more interest I guess in the Clinton administration. I remember I also backed up the woman who did Sierra Leone where there was a much bloodier and more kind of hard fought civil war going on. The UN was involved in that as well. We were providing a lot of military, I guess, equipment and support to the UN for use in Sierra Leone and I remember we used to have these, I'd never done this in the old days, but we would have these video-conferences. You'd go up to the seventh floor and you'd sit in one of these rooms and there would be the Pentagon or the NSC, wherever the thing, well actually they would all be on various TV's and you could talk to people. It was kind of interesting to see the interagency process at work. I mean it got down to such terrific miniscule details about supplies or various kinds of equipment; the cost, where it was coming from and blah, blah. It was a matter of, to me anyhow, it was beyond my area of knowledge. I couldn't understand what it was all about nor do I think really the State Department has that kind of expertise. These things tend to get very much, once you militarize the situation, the Pentagon takes over and they run it. We're just sort of playing catch up all the time and I'm sure it's the same in the Iraq or Afghan situation. It's all militarized. There's no diplomacy involved anymore. It's just a question of high power being brought to bear you know. Technology is supposedly going to make a difference.

Q: Well then you retired in 2002? What have you been doing since?

ANDERSON: I was already teaching one night a week at Northern Virginia Community College.So I've expanded that. I do three classes now. I also moved over and started doing some teaching at George Mason. In fact this past year I had two classes at George Mason and one class at NOVA. I teach American history and Western Civilization.

Q: Is there much interest in diplomacy per se?

ANDERSON: Among the students?

Q: Yeah. You've got the college level. Is anybody interested in courses in diplomacy?

ANDERSON: I haven't heard of any interest. Not at those two places anyhow. Occasionally somebody comes up to me, one of students will come up and ask about the Foreign Service exam or a career in the Foreign Service. Yeah, I've had some people who are going to take the exam. But actually these are required courses and what I found is that most of, maybe in more advanced courses you would get that kind of interest in diplomacy. But in the required courses like Western Civilization anthe American history survey which is a required thing at George Mason. I get a lot of students who probably don't even know what the Foreign Service is. They really are more focused on, and many of them are foreign students anyhow, focused on getting a degree in accounting or some other very practical subject. I mean it's not exactly a well known or I guess commonly pursued course of study. Although I must say, I've had some people that I would have never guessed going to take a course, it's called International Relations and they do also area studies and they learn a foreign language. My son's girlfriend did that down at Virginia Tech and now she is working in a stock brokerage, so.

Q: Okay, we'll stop at this point. I want to thank you very much.

ANDERSON: My pleasure.

End of interview